



# MORAL CONSEQUENCES OF SIR R. PEEL'S UNPRINCIPLED AND FATAL COURSE, DISQUIET, OVERTURN, AND REVOLUTION.

CHIEFLY FROM THE NEWSPAPER WRITINGS OF  
ISAAC BUCHANAN,

FORMERLY PRESIDENT OF THE BOARDS OF TRADE OF TORONTO AND HAMILTON, C. W., AND MEMBER FOR TORONTO, THE THEN METROPOLIS, IN THE FIRST PARLIAMENT OF UNITED CANADA.

"Our Colonies are passing from us before we have learned the use of them."—*Spectator*.

"The fact is that in our politics in Great Britain and Ireland, no less than in the European countries in revolt, we are being taught that there is a government of the affairs of this world superior to that of statesmen. We see that a wrong principle cannot possibly be carried out, because its own operation cuts its own throat. We see that if the late commercial machinery we have set up in this country will not operate practical philanthropy, it can, (like the continental royalties), only exist till the evils it occasions become intolerable."—*The Crisis of Sir R. Peel's Mission*.

"I will overturn, overturn, overturn it; and it shall be no more, until He comes whose right it is: and I will give it *Him*."

The Original of all authority thus declares that immoral acts are revolutionary in their nature, although, for wise purposes not at the time seen by us, they are permitted for the moment; and why I now anticipate more fearful consequences than have yet flowed from the cruel principle of Peel's Money Law of 1819, is because I see clearly that our protective system, as restricting imports of foreign produce, necessarily prevented the export of Gold and the blowing up of the Banking System, which in his wisdom Peel has based on the *shifting* foundation of our stock of the precious metals, imitating the man who built his house on the sand, in all except the important point that it is not his own, but the Public's, vital Interests which he has so abominably trifled with.

"To the great question,—CAN THE BRITISH MONARCHY BE PRESERVED?—THE GREATEST—THE MOST ENDURING—THE MOST DIGNIFIED—PERSONIFICATION OF MIGHT AND PRACTICAL PRINCIPLE THAT HAS BEEN TESTED BY TIME? I answer No, emphatically No, unless our Upper Classes permit the immediate adoption of measures which their personal interest will, I fear, make them dangerous as revolutionaries, just as the Slave-breeding Lord of Republicans America prefers risking the integrity of the Republic rather than yield the wretched 'bastinado' of slavery. I believe the people of England are as loyal as ever to the Monarchy, but I don't believe their self-respect will any longer permit them to tolerate church establishments, exclusive universities, or the uncontrolled interference of the nobility in the legislation of the country. The time has come when the POSSIBILITY OF SAVING THE CROWN ITSELF depends on our having it distinctly understood, that the objects of the Government are just the simple, practical, and disinterested objects of philanthropy, a boldly and unequivocally expressed by Oliver Cromwell when he said, 'If any man thinks that the interest of these nations and the interest of Christianity are two separate and distinct things, I wish my soul may never enter into his secret.' And I have not the least doubt that every Government, till it has come to feel itself the mere instrument of God's purposes, is liable to the moral consequences of its conduct, *iniquity, overturn, and revolution*."—From my letter to Lord George Bentinck on the breaking out of the Revolutions on the Continent, dated New York, 24th March, 1848, and published at the time. A great part of my object in this letter was to repeat my often-expressed feeling of the danger, in England, from the circumstance that although Peel's legislation of 1819, taken in connection with the entirely contrary principle (the one piece of legislation makes gold necessary to confidence or property in this country, the other leads to the exportation of gold!) of his money law of 1819, loudly demands an immediate union of the funds of our own working classes; this is rendered a thing practically impossible by our now irreconcileable divisions as to the effects of a Church Establishment; so that, as the vital question of labour cannot at present receive an unprejudiced discussion, Peel and his irreconcileable Free Trade will be submitted to, even though they are seen evidently to reduce our national employment, because our protestant legislators love their Church (the particular ecclesiastical machinery which they *unconsciously call the Church*) better than they love their country.

"The triumph he covets in the laborious triumph of just ideas, without distinction or origin; it is the reform of all inveterate abuses; it is the simplification of all the complicated, imperfect, costly wheels of routine; it is the realisation of Henry IV. and Napoleon—emperor; it is the extinction of pauperism; it is the completion of universal suffrage by universal wellbeing. Universal wellbeing! If you say it is Utopia, we answer that it is a necessity, and that civilization placed now, in this narrow alternative, to get over the obstacle, or to fall into the abyss. Universal wellbeing, general ease, is not an Utopia; no, pauperism is not a necessity; it does not exist in nature; there is no reason why it should be perpetuated in society. Pauperism is not the work of God; it arises from the ignorance of man, and the imperfection of society. You call yourselves pious. Cease then to blaspheme Divine Providence, by laying on it a responsibility which is wholly human."—*The Press* of last Thursday, 31st January, 1850.

"To see the Noble Lord and his Honourable Friends on the one hand, with Messrs. Hunt and Wooler on the other, united in their attempt to pull down the mighty fabric erected by the immortal Pitt, was at once ludicrous and painful." The first Sir Robert Peel's Speech in Parliament on 24th May, 1819, on the memorable occasion of his presenting the petition of the Merchants and Bankers of London, deprecating the proposed fixed Gold standard. This, and Peel's father's continued denunciations of his great set ought to put an end to the notion that, in expressing our irreconcileable objections to his principles and measures, we have any personal hostility to the Right Honourable Baronet.

While independence has any existence in this country we must persist in agreeing with his father that Peel has ruined his country, even if (as his father predicted he would) he had not doubled his own fortune by the same act! Peel in 1819 took the low Shylock ground of viewing the question of money, as one only between money and property in existence, instead of seeing the chief importance of money (or the medium of exchange) to be as a machinery for the production of property and its distribution so as to give the greatest possible advantage to the industrious classes, as opposed to the lay rich, annuitants, or non-producers; this alone will make his name stink in the nostrils of future generations, and make history deny him the place either of a great man or a great statesman; and I hold this alone sufficient justification for my assertion, that "no *strong* in any country has ever been the cause of so much suffering to his subjects as Sir R. Peel has been to our industrious classes." But the directly dishonest conduct of the moneyed classes who then ruled supreme in Parliament (as in fact they do yet), the landlords having first been bribed by the corn-law of 1815, was in their enabling Peel in 1819 to add one half to our national burdens as measured in the value of commodities, or to speak more plainly, in the Poor man's time. Peel's money bill of 1819 enacts that the public creditor should be paid in gold pounds worth 20s, instead of in gold pounds worth about 13s 4d. Even if the Government, when borrowing in paper (and the debt is greatly composed of funded Exchequer Bills) pounds worth 13s 4d in gold, had promised to pay back in gold pounds worth 20s, a transaction so nefarious could no more be expected than could a similar transaction by a Trustee, the party lending the money knowing it to be illegal. The public creditor in fact bought stock from Pitt and his successors at, say, £60 for every £100 of consols; but this £60 was not worth more than £40 in gold at £2 17s 10d the ounce; and Peel passed a bill in 1819 agreeing to pay the public creditor £100 in gold at £2 17s 10d per ounce! I cannot in so short space explain the distinction drawn by Mr Pitt between gold money and paper money, as by the following quotation from CORBETT'S PAPERS AGAINST GOLD. In the debate on 28th February 1707, the Opposition had charged the Minister with having taken money from the Bank and sent it abroad in subsidies, and this quotation is the substance of Mr Pitt's victorious and most complete reply—"Pitt said that Mr Hussey was wholly in error to suppose that the bank made advances to the Government in *specie*; Pitt said, that the advances were made in *notes*, and paid in the same manner; that if the Government were to *raise* money and pay the bank, the bank would not therefore be supplied with an additional guinea in *specie*; that the taxes were not paid in *specie*; that loans were advanced without any idea of *repayment in specie*; that the bank never had it in contemplation that every quarterly dividend was to be paid in *cash*; that the receipt of the revenue was in *paper*, and that the whole of Mr Hussey's observations were entirely founded in mistake." Who then can doubt that Peel's Legislation was most immoral, while in inhumanity nothing can go beyond the cruel spirit of his act of 1819, which makes the rich richer, and the poor poorer, more and more, as the millionaires' accumulations sap the independence of higher and higher classes in the walks of industry?

GREENOCK.—PUBLISHED AT THE ADVERTISER OFFICE,

And to be had at the Offices of the *Greenock Advertiser* in Greenock and Glasgow (40, Union Street); at Mr Mann's, Bookseller, Cornhill, London; and at Messrs John Hartill & Sons, Waterloo Place, Edinburgh—where may also be had the entire Pamphlet when completed.

## TRIUMPH TO PEEL JUST MEANS RUIN TO HIS COUNTRY'S WORKING CLASSES.

"It is remarkable that Free Trade has been carried by the Middle Classes, not only without the assistance of the Working Classes but in spite of their opposition."—Ebenezer Elliot, the Corn Law Rhymer, dated 17th October, 1849.

It will be a virtual abdication by the present parliamentary constituents, if the middle classes permit Peel and the monied class another triumph over the industry of the empire—for a continuance of the bureaucratic system, and the continued triumph of Peel and his Whig placenters, are just convertible terms for the funeral knell of British principle and repudiation of patriotism. I know of course that in the Queen's speech it is said—"Her Majesty has great gratification in congratulating you on the improved condition of commerce and manufactures. It is with regret that her Majesty observes the complaints which, in many parts of the Kingdom, have been received from the owners and occupiers of land. Her Majesty greatly laments that any portion of her subjects should be in distress; but it is a source of gratification to her Majesty to witness the increased enjoyment of the necessities and comforts which cheapness and plenty have bestowed on the great body of the people." But I cannot forget that in January, 1819, the King's Speech said—"The Prince Regent has the greatest satisfaction in being able to inform you that the trade, commerce, and manufactures of the country are in a most flourishing condition." Both agriculture and manufactures were prosperous at that period, but Peel's Bill of 1819 passed, and in November of the same year, the Parliament is addressed in a very different strain: the King's Speech says—"I have observed with great concern the attempts made in some of the manufacturing districts to take advantage of local distress, to excite disaffection to the institutions and government of the country. A spirit is now fully manifested, utterly hostile to the constitution of this Kingdom, and aiming, not only at the change of those political institutions which have hitherto constituted the pride and security of this country, but at the subversion of the rights of property, and of all order in society." The operation of Peel's Money Bill may be (I think will be) as fatal in 1860, or very shortly thereafter.

It will be admitted by all who take the trouble to reflect on the subject, that any serious lessening of employment in this country, so artificial is the situation of our industrial classes, could not fail to cause political confusion, even in the presence of loyalty to the Crown and to the reigning Sovereign, which has never at any former period been exceeded; and on my mind there is not the shadow of a doubt that Peel's irreconcileable Free Trade principle must necessarily produce the dreaded cause. Peel's monetary legislation of 1819 crushed down wages on an average to near the starvation point, and quite to it if the lost time of the unemployed is considered; his monetary legislation also tended to reduce employment through contracting the currency; but the vital blow at our national employment is Peel's having, in 1846, arranged for the increase of our imports of foreign labour, not only without demanding reciprocity (so as to curtail the drain on us for the precious metals which sustain our currency, such as it is), but without first revolutionising our monetary laws, so as to admit of our increasing our exports of British goods. A large supply of gold from California would effect exactly what monetary reformers have always sought, as gold once fallen abroad, the sustaining of our fixed price would leave the sovereign the representative of 90s. value in British commodities, instead of as now the representative of itself, or a certain weight of a foreign commodity; but the same alien or Jew principle that prevents the alteration of the law now in justice to British industry, would then lead to the alteration, thus crushing the golden prospects of the working man. With, therefore, what is more likely a drain on us for gold in payment of imports, our manufacturing ability must be speedily and fearfully reduced, and I am astonished that men who believe Free Trade a thing practicable would delay the use of every means to get a full supply for this country of an internal circulation, or money, which could not be removed to other countries. I see clearly that without paper money, or in other words the repeal of Peel's law of 1819, our one-sided Free Trade has no chance whatever of success, although I feel nearly as well satisfied that even with paper money it will not eventually succeed, and that free imports of commodities produced by ourselves, unless the trade is reciprocal, must lead to reduced employment in this country among our manufacturing and mechanical population, as well as in the agricultural and mining districts. Not only, therefore, is Peel's legislation of 1846, in my mind, utterly impracticable, *under any circumstances*, but I see that any chance of success to it is upset by the continued existence of his monetary legislation of 1819, which is an embodiment of the exactly contrary theory of Trade.

The jarring and utterly irreconcileable principles of Peel's Bills of 1819 and 1846 will of course force a change before very long; but to the extent this can be hastened will the suffering to the people, and the danger to the country be lessened. What then are the working classes to do as a first step? I answer, let them refuse their confidence to every man who refuses his confidence to them; let them refuse to listen to the details of any man who is not their political friend in the sense of going with them for their political enfranchisement—in a word, for the principle of Universal Suffrage—which I firmly believe to be—in the true or patriotic, and not the party sense of Conservatism—the most conservative measure that can be proposed this day in Great Britain, Ireland, and the Colonies, as *sure* to lead to a just protection to highly taxed British against Foreign untaxed industry, and to the vindication of the rights of labour as opposed to the usurpations of money.

It is difficult to account for the gross ignorance of Sir R. Peel and the Manchester school on the subject of the true interests of the working classes. The working men themselves, however, are opening their eyes to the fact, that food is not the *first* necessity, but employment, or the means of getting food, and that the question of labour or employment for the population, and the question of money, are one and the same question; and thus they are coming also gradually to see that they are in the same boat with men of fixed property, and, indeed, with every interest but that of the mere monied class. Sir James Graham pointed this out long ago:—[See "Cornwall Gurney," 1827.] The working men begin to see that when they hire out their labour or skill for wages, they, under our monstrous money law, are buyers of gold, and that when gold is hoarded or exported to the diminution of its quantity, they must (according to the internal law of supply and demand) give more time for less gold, so that their wages fall, even if they are not completely deprived of employment. In a word, the British artisan has to give more time or labour for gold, but the London Jew and the foreigner have not to give more money gold! This cruel result to the working men and their families (fault equally in reducing the price of all property) arises from no cause within their own control. Prudence could not prevent it; as prudence gets to a discount in their eyes. It arises from the ebb and flow of foreign trade being permitted to regulate directly, and most arbitrarily to affect, the value of all property, including the labour of the poor man's hands although he may never have worked for a foreign master! The means by which this is effected is in the making the plentiful article money (it should be plentiful if productive property, or value, of which money is merely the representative, is plentiful) always hold the same value as the scarce article gold—a consumption which Sir Robert Peel effected when, in 1819, he upset Mr. Pitt's money law, and thus gave the neck of the industry of this country to the feet of the money monopolists, by a violation of the law of supply and demand so outrageous, that its very impudent excess blinded the public to it at first, and has ever since continued to do so. No minister would dare to have attempted the same result above-board. If the gold were made to rise as indigo or any other commodity does, without wages and price exchanged for it being permitted to rise equally, THE MINISTER WOULD HAVE BEEN STROWN—but the very same thing is done indirectly, only that the rise in gold is directly expressed, not by the rise of gold, but by the rise of the rate of interest, and which never fails to cause a fall, and not a rise in wages and prices!

## SHORT VIEW OF OUR CRITICAL POSITION.

We deceive ourselves if we suppose that the people remain so ignorant as not to know that the lowering of the price of *Gold* is an equivalent term for raising the purchasing power of *money*—or, in other words, for lowering the exchangeable value of property, commodities, and labour. The Working-Classes have been taught by long and most cruel experience, that the principle of the Money Law of 1819 practically denies to British labour the reward which the Law of Supply and Demand would naturally award to it, by leading to the export of gold (which upsets the country's Banking facilities), and thus contracting the currency whenever the foreigner prefers taking *Gold*, which he of course does unless the price of British Manufactures approximates in cheapness to that of Gold—even although the same Foreigner did not import into this country Gold, or other commodity sold at the cheap rate, but had availed of a Paper or "prosperity" price for

the Foreign Commodities in payment of which the imbecility of our Law puts it in his power to take *Gold* at the cheap rate.—They now see clearly, that the fact of *Gold* being absurdly fixed at the same low rate when it is in the greatest demand as when it is in the smallest demand for *exportation as a commodity* necessarily fixes down, at the general rule, to the same low, unattracted, and profitless standard the remuneration to the producers of British Commodities, which have to be sold *against Gold as a Commodity to Foreigners*, as well as *into Gold as a Money to our own people in the same market!* So much for our manufacturing or mechanical labour; (which is either sold to the foreigner or to the non-producing consumer—at the same price to both and as a general rule at a price as low, or nearly as low, as the unattracted and profitless price of its competitor, the commodity gold)—and as to imports of agricultural produce which we have to pay for in gold at a low fixed foreign standard, it amounts to nothing short of the insanity that would exchange full weight sovereigns for

clipped ones; is gold (which is a "price" to cover prices—for the price of wheat as the in gold to a round get 32s. per quarter lbs. of raw cotton giving the farmer, without ton at 9d. per lb. country, to collect all sorts, tax the foreigner by the day would have

We admit our TAXATION is to include our "tax" that will agree virtually collected but we argue to REPUDIATION OF

As the only A STOP TO FROM WAG REAL AND ASSUME THE my letter to the laws:—

"I also begin to mediate necessary industry being in this way this can be the National (thus declaratory bound for the country. But I despair as it is, and the only crushed the principle, the debt. My vindicate the National country. have to pay a thousand million next year. Mounds of the Being handed the measure country's property."

"By no means at all. MARKET OVER PARENT REPUBLIC as fixed property will of course British industry (unprotested voted, as above QUER DIFICULTY NAME TO PAY."

"As I was to whom I refer the answer to which may suggest not—said he in continuing to hold in such divisions of the consider the currency re-societies), is Peel's Money classes being consequences his measurement in this

[WIRKUNG N  
My answer two classes to be alive British industry the empire public had at would yet up in arms dependence on their own armament for its support? and if,

## ASSES.

toned class  
nph of Peel  
m. I know  
d condition  
Kingdom,  
er subjects  
earies and  
uary, 1919,  
commerces  
ous at that  
ent strain;  
ots to take  
fully mani  
tions which  
all order in

ent in this presence of and there is no. Peel's time of the day; but the hour, not only as it is),

ge supply  
sustaining  
the repre-  
sentation of  
king man.  
especially  
and  
means to  
see clearly  
whatever of  
imports of  
among our  
is Peel's  
it is upset  
ade.

terests of  
necessary,  
question of  
h men of  
ago:—  
sy, under  
hey must  
not com-  
Jew and  
reducing  
to a dis-  
arily to  
iga mar-  
perty, or  
consum-  
industry of  
its very  
tempted  
price ex-  
directly,

ility of  
rate.—  
ly fixed  
as when  
ity ne-  
untax-  
ers of  
id as a  
ta our  
storing  
er or to  
and as a  
ntaxed  
)—and  
for in  
y short  
na for

clipped ones ; it is in fact and practice just England bartering gold, (which is a foreign commodity) without adding a profit or "price" to cover taxation, for foreign produce at British or taxed prices—for the foreigner gets the same price for the same quality of wheat as the Yorkshire farmer—although the foreigner is paid in gold at a raw material price ;—in other words, supposing both get £20 per quarter or 4s per bushel—for his 4s the foreigner takes 8 lbs. of raw cotton as imported from America at say 3d per lb., giving the industry of this country no employment ; the Yorkshire farmer, without getting a higher nominal price, is paid in the cotton at 6d per lb, after 3d has been added to it as a profit to this country, to cover wages, mill rent, house rent—rates and charges of all sorts, taxation, &c., &c. He gets 5½ lbs. of cotton, while the foreigner gets 8 lbs. ; the difference being the gain this country would have if the foreigner was paid in goods instead of gold.

"We admit that with paper money (AND FOREIGNERS CHARGED  
OUR TAXATION IF THEY TOOK GOLD IN PAYMENT), our "prices" would  
include our "taxation," and that under free trade with countries  
that will agree to take payment in these fixed goods we would be  
virtually collecting an import duty in the best way of doing so;  
but we argue that FAIR TRADE WITHOUT RECIPROCITY is a VIRTUAL  
REPUDIATION OF THE NATIONAL DEBT OR BANKRUPTCY—AND  
BANKRUPTCY (AS THE Times HAS WELL SAID) IS REVOLUTION.

As the only way to avoid National Bankruptcy, and TO PUT A STOP TO OUR TAXATION BEING A DEDUCTION FROM WAGES AS AT PRESENT THE PROPERTY, REAL AND PERSONAL, OF THE COUNTRY MUST ASSUME THE NATIONAL DEBT. This I pointed out in my letter to the *Glasgow Examiner* of 23rd May, 1848, as follows:—

"— I also begin to have my eyes open to the absolute and immediate necessity of preventing the taxation on the country's industry being as at present a deduction from wages, in the only way this can be prevented, viz., by separating the management of the National Debt from the office of Chancellor of the Exchequer (thus declaring that the realised property of the country is alone bound for the present and all future national debts or obligations). But I despair of seeing this done by Parliament, constituted as it is, and the industry of the country must remain in a miserably crushed condition till we repudiate the principle, or want of principle, that took off the war tax without taking off the war debt. My view is that the industry of the country should repudiate the National Debt, leaving it to be paid by the property of the country. Commissioners of the National Debt would thus have to pay the interest by levying a half per cent. on our six thousand millions of property, real and personal, but the percentage next year would come to be reduced by the balance in the hands of the Chancellor of the Exchequer this year, such balance being handed over to the Commissioners of the National Debt as the measure of the protection to native industry afforded by

"By no other means than thus setting the English money market at defiance, can the fixed property and industry of this country ever get represented by a great party in the State. A HONEST REPRESENTATIVE OF LABOUR (which in interest is the same as fixed property, as it is labour that gives property its value), will of course never get the support of the money market; so British industry must either be contented to remain unrepresented (unprotected), or the support of the money market must be voted, as above, to be no longer necessary, THE DAY OF EXHIBITION Distinguishing TURNING OUT, OR KEEPING OUT A MINISTRY, being THE DAY TO PAY TO THE TOWER OR AT THE CAPITOL!"

MADE TO PASS TO THE TOMB OF ALL THE CAPULETS!"  
As I was finishing the foregoing, a friend called on me, to whom I read it; and he put the following question to me, my answer to which I am anxious to give here, as the same query may suggest itself to some of my other friends and readers. It is not—said he—quite clear to me why you think there is any use in continuing your opposition "Peel's fatal policy," since you hold in such contempt, and have no hope from, either of the two divisions of Sir R. Peel's opponents, viz., the *Protestants* who consider the ex-Premier's measure of 1846 to be fatal, and the *concurrency* reformers (as represented by the London and Liverpool societies), mostly composed of Free Traders, who believe that Peel's Money Bill of 1819 was originally the cause of the working classes being defrauded of remunerative wages, and will now, in consequence of his doing away with the restriction on imports by his measure of 1846, lead also to so vastly diminished employment as certainly to cause social confusion and political convulsion in this country!

[WITHOUT IMMEDIATE PROTECTION THE WESTERN COLONIES WILL BE LOST TO THE EMPIRE.]

My answer is, that though I have no hope from either of the two classes of Peel's opponents, I see that the public do not seem to be alive to the fact, that without immediate protection to British industry, the Western Colonies will be immediately lost to the empire. I think I am right in assuming that, if the British public had their eyes opened to this, the melancholy issue I point out would yet be prevented in some way. Can I suppose sane men in arms, as even the Manchester school is now, about our dependence on foreigners for our supply of cotton, being willing, by their own act, to make the country also dependent on foreigners for its supply of the other great staples, wheat, sugar, and timber?

and M. after having lost the Colonies, the reversal of Peel's

policy will be necessary to save this country from a war of classes, such as we have the beginning of at Stafford and at the late meeting of the working classes at Stepney in London. Is it not a pity the subject should not be understood now?

I may, in conclusion, be allowed to explain how I think the Currency Reformers are wrong in supposing that, after the Colonies are lost, the prosperity of the working classes may be attained by means of paper money, in which gold would rise in price, thus enabling the producer to get back in "price" from the foreigner and consumer the taxation paid by the industry of this country. Before there were free imports, I admit that paper money would have enabled the British producer to add the "taxation" he had paid to his "price." If the price of producing wheat were 25s., and the taxation 25 per cent., the farmer would get 40s. for his wheat. But under the present system (which I hold to be suicide on the part of all the industries), both manufacturing and agricultural, no sooner would the price be raised to 45s., but it comes fifteen millions of quarters of wheat "using no tax, which has to be got back in "price," to add to our own sixty-five millions of home growth, and down goes the price to 8s., under the law of supply and demand. In fact, it is evident that British industry, under free imports, will be no better off *with the advantage of paper money* than it was under a protected system *without the advantage of paper money*. And, when one thinks of it, how absurd for Free Traders to be monetary reformers! They accuse Peel of reducing prices and wages by his bill of 1819, and they do the same thing by their Free Trade measures. They accuse Peel of indirectly giving a foreign price to British labour, by giving a foreign price to gold, which the foreigner has it always in his power to prefer to British goods the moment these get up to a "prosperity" point; and they *directly* give a foreign price to British labour "by permitting free imports of foreign labour." But, even were we to use any use in their triumph over Peel, this is rendered *practically impossible* by their attacking Peel simultaneously on his banking bill of 1844, on which he must always triumph over them (especially if he puts out the monopolist clause and allows new banks under the same restrictions). The country is anxious for monetary reform, or the repeal of Peel's bill of 1819, but not at the expense of a chaos of banking.

[If we through emblematic money enable the producer in this country to include his taxes in his "Price," then we can safely have free trade with countries that will take British goods in return.]

My long held view is, that British prices, through the instrumentality of paper money (and a consequent appreciation of the commodity gold, as compared to its price abroad), should be permitted to rise sufficiently to cover our taxation, and to prevent all our tax being practically a deduction from wages as at present; this once effected, the foreigner who takes British goods will be paying British taxes, and THIS WILL BE bona fide Free TRADE; but, at present, whenever prices and wages rise to a remunerative point, it becomes the interest of the foreigner to take gold, which is not permitted (by Peel's infamous law of 1819) to do. When prices are produced the foreigner avails of them, as he gets more for his produce—but under Peel's alien legislation, he is enabled to avoid paying more for the gold which he takes in return! THE SUBJECT OF THE CROWN TAX is not attended to, because the public have taken up the impression that "it is impossible to understand it." Instead of this, it is the easiest possible of all the principles, an understanding of which is vital to every man's safety in a commercial country. If people would only read my friend Mr Cappa's pamphlet, *"The Nation in a Dilemma,"* they would at once get understand.

"It is well known," observes Mr. Cappa, "that by the pressure of the atmosphere water will rise in a vacuum (the barrel of a pump for instance) to about thirty-three feet. Now, suppose that the water in a certain vacuum had always been prevented by the interposition of a plug, from rising higher than ten feet, it would follow that, when this plug was raised one, two, or ten feet higher, the water would immediately rush up, and fill the additional vacuum created. Now, had the plug never been entirely withdrawn, and people had not known what was the cause which produced the rise of the water, they might have concluded that the water would rise ad infinitum, and that it was necessary to interpose a limiting power to prevent it overflowing and deluging everything around. But it is obvious that the removal of the plug was not the cause of the rise of the water, but was only that which permitted it to rise; the cause was the weight of the atmosphere, and it ceased to act when an equilibrium was gained. So, in like manner, the extension of the currency is not the cause of the rise of prices, as many think, but is only that which permits it; the cause is the weight of taxation, and the rise will cease whenever a price which will form an equilibrium with the weight of taxation is obtained."

It is clear, however, that Mr. Capps must anticipate the foreigner also to be taxed, otherwise the British Producer could never add his taxation to his "Price," but must deduct it from the wages of his workers. In the long run capital must be profitable or it will not (indeed it could not) continue to co-operate with the poor man, or, in other words, to give employment to our masses; and thus it is that, directly or indirectly, the working classes pay all our taxes. If taxes cannot be included in "price," the only ultimate alternative is to deduct them from wages.

**THE MOST FEARFUL SOCIAL CONVULSIONS COULD NOT FAIL TO ARISE OUT OF ANY SUCCESSFUL ATTEMPT IN PARLIAMENT TO PERPETUATE THE PRINCIPLE OF SIR R. PEEL'S MONEY LAW OF 1819 TO CRUSH OUR WORKING CLASSES BY LOWERING OUR FIXED PRICE OF GOLD DOWN TO THE VALUE TO WHICH GOLD MAY FALL ABROAD.**

"Peel's system must be destroyed by violence." The late Lord Wharncliffe, President of her Majesty's Council in the last Ministry of Sir Robert Peel.—(See *Banker's Circular* of 23d July, 1847.)

"The present threatening aspect of our Monetary matters will not be temporary, but permanent, because it arises not from a temporary but from a permanent cause—namely, in fact, it is not a derangement of our Monetary and Banking system, but an incurable paralysis thereof. I view it to be *THE CAUSE*, *THE PLAT*, our waiting time in suspense about the *MAN'S MACHINERY* or *THE BANK OF ENGLAND* (the Bill of 1844) as established by Sir Robert Peel—so much child's play as if a physician, called to a patient in whom life (the Bill of 1819) is expiring, were to devote his whole attention to an examination into the form or outward structure of the patient's limbs, or as if we were to stop to praise the marvellous *admiral*—to its use of the channel of a mighty river, when its well-springs are drying up, or when its waters have flown away."—My letter to Lord George Bentinck, published in April, 1847.

"There is at the present time a complete plethora in the money market. The rate for money at call is nominally two per cent, though there would be great difficulty in placing any large sum on these terms. This superabundance of unemployed money capital, abundant only because *THE MEANS OF EMPLOYING IT HAD PROFOUNDLY BEEN OVERPOWERED*, cannot fail, under the present system, to produce its usual effects. The low rate of interest will lead to speculations of some kind or other, and to numerous engagements, to be as certainly allowed by stagnation and distress. The Californian gold may for a time ward off panic, but will not prevent it ultimately coming upon the nation."—The justly celebrated letter of "Goslin," Birmingham, November 30, 1846.

"After the experience of 1847, what guarantees can be given that in contracting to pay a rent of fifty guineas next Midsummer, we are not incurring a liability equal to sixty guineas at their present value? And although, on the other hand, it may be extravagant to suppose that gold will ever become as abundant as lead, what assurance have we that we shall be able, six months hence, or in all future time, to obtain exactly a sovereign's worth for a sovereign, a shilling's worth for a shilling, and a penny's worth for a penny? Are the 5 dwt., 3 grs. of gold, which, technically and legally, represent a pound, really a standard of value in the sense of purchasing power, or only a sliding scale?"—*Westminster Review*.

"Before, however, the gigantic speculations upon human labour, in which the manufacturers here and elsewhere fondly indulge can be carried out to completion, something yet remains to be conceded—that is, the will of the labouring classes. There is a mind, whose secret workings and deep communings with itself the world does not seem to heed; there is a voice whose faint accents in all their strength and power the world has not yet heard—the mind and the voice of the working population throughout Christendom, burdened beyond the power of further endurance, and asking on every hand, where the region of righteous resistance begins? If governments take not good heed, this mind and voice will one day give utterance to the sense of wrong unjustly inflicted in every and ways that will shake from their foundations all the existing institutions of the earth. The doctrine that the only true capital is labour, however specious and unmeaning in its application, is gaining fast hold of the minds of the masses. The claim of the workman to eat the fruits of the earth—a partake of the gifts of God—to be warm and to be clothed—to be fed when he is hungry, and to be sheltered from the storm, in fair return for the toil of his arm, and the sweat of his brow, is daily making itself heard in accents that cannot be mistaken. A communion of interests—of indignation at the infliction of past wrongs—of determination to resist fresh oppression, is binding the labouring classes of all lands into one powerful fraternity. To meet this growing confederacy is by far the most difficult task of the statesman in the present day; for it is by far the most fearful and dangerous element with which he has had yet to deal."—*The Church of England Quarterly Review* of April 1846.

"The fact is that the price not only of corn, but of commodities generally, began to fall in 1819, and gradually settled down in proportion to the contraction of the currency, until the year 1822. The bitter fruit of the system was tested by all classes—I am in error when I say by all; for amidst the ruin of the farmer and the manufacturer, the distress of landlords, and the inhumanity of a population without bread and without employment one class flourished and was triumphant; the annuitant and the tax-eater rejoiced in the increased value of money, in the sacrifice of productive industry to unproductive wealth—in the victory of the drones over the bees."—*Sir James Graham's Postscript on Corn and Currency*, published in 1827.

"No man knows better than the author of 'Corn and Currency' the main causes of the low prices of 1822, and few men have been more familiar during the last twenty years with the application of means for lifting up prices from a state of ruinous depression when the consequences alarmed the ruling power. Sir James Graham knows perfectly that no analogy can be fairly drawn between the cases of 1822 and 1846, and that of 1846-50, either as to the cause of probable duration of each, or the means of relief. He knows that the low prices and paralysis of agricultural industry in 1822 were caused by the screwing up of the value of Money by 'the enormous error' of 1819. Within the last two years he has admitted (as reported by Mr Speerer in a speech in the House of Commons which was never contradicted by the Right Honourable Baronet) that he still considered the Act of 1819 as one of the most unjust and oppressive measures ever submitted to Parliament. He knows that his efforts so alarmed the Government that Lord Londonderry, &c., &c.—*Banker's Circular* of last week, 5th February, 1850, bring me extracts of Sir James Graham's 'Postscript to his Treasury.'

"Approval of the purchasing power of money [or, in other words, cheapness of commodities] on the contrary, is a check to production. The farmer who pays his rent and taxes, when money is dear, with the proceeds of 60 quarters of wheat instead of 50, and ten quarters less for other purposes than he calculated on when he took the farm. While his labourers are congratulating themselves that a shilling will now go farther than it did a year or two ago, he is making up his mind to turn some of them adrift. The landlord, the fundholder, and all who stand in the relation of creditors receive the benefit while it lasts, but it lasts only while the goose is dying, which laid the golden egg. Ultimately land is thrown up, manufacturing operations are suspended, rents fall, the fixed burden of the taxes becomes more and more intolerable, and if we were to imagine the process of appreciation of money continuing for a great number of years in a country morselled with the interest of a debt, like that of England, which could not be shaken off or reduced like private obligations, the end would necessarily be national bankruptcy and universal confusion. These facts were noted by David Hume, but they have been almost wholly lost sight of by modern economists."

"From the *Westminster Review* of January, 1848. Any one carefully studying this must come to see that Mr Cobden and the political economists are either very criminal in dragging the public mind, as they have, to the value, to a country's industrial classes, of 'cheapness,' or are so stupid as not to be able to understand that the cheapness of commodities is a convertible term for the cheapness of money.]

**THE QUESTION OF MONEY—HOW IT WILL BE AFFECTED BY LARGE IMPORTS OF GOLD FROM CALIFORNIA.**

To the *Editor of the Weekly Register*.

Edinburgh, 24th Feb., 1849.—Sir, \* \* \* \* \* No one can help praising the consistency of the *Times* in its decision that, as in 1819 gold was by law *fixed* down to a price lower than its natural or average price in this country, without the debtor class being enabled to discharge their debts with proportionably less gold, so in 1849 the debtor should have the same unjust advantage over the creditor class, as the least reparation the latter could offer. Monetary reformers must however deplore that the *Times* and the bullionists should have taken so low a position in 1819 in regard to money and currency as to view the question as one only between money and property in existence, instead of seeing the chief importance of money to be as a machinery for the production of property and its proper distribution. \* \* \*

Nothing but the most abject political holiness could have made the working-classes endure up to this day Sir Robert Peel's *money law*. To see this, and to be satisfied that NO TYRANT IN ANY COUNTRY HAS EVER BEEN THE CAUSE OF SO MUCH SUFFERING TO HIS SUBJECTS AS SIR R. PEEL HAS BEEN TO OUR WORKING-CLASSES, we

have only to understand the practical operation of his bill of 1819. Under it (with gold here fixed down to the price abroad) our commercial history must necessarily be a succession of money panics, for it is utterly impossible to attain prosperity without ITS becoming the cause of immediate distress in this country! \* \* \* \* \*

The issue of paper pounds as the legal tender (or payable at the London market price of gold), was the only remedy while the foreign price was as high as our fixed price. In no other way could remunerative prices long be got by our manufacturers and producers, even when they had an extensive demand for their wares—as the opposing article gold was always to be had equally cheap when scarce as when plentiful in this country. But if the foreign price of gold is to be greatly and permanently lower than £4 the ounce, our retention of the sovereign, or a quarter of an ounce of gold, as the counter for our pound sterling, will suit the same purpose of enabling prices of British commodities to rise to the level of the demand for them; and indeed with our fixed price above the foreign price, the use by us of the gold money as a legal tender will be far preferable, as having TWO INDIRECT ADVANTAGES which in circumstances (especially under the operation of free imports) will be of vital importance in increasing the employment, and thus sustaining the wages of our working-classes. While we continue to make gold the basis of our bank-note circulation and facilities, it is evidently the in-

terest of our industry to be imported, making an evident cause that we will readily find in our fixed price. *Similarly* (in the cause, if gold being the greatest)

FIRSTLY—industry on advances above sterling prices of gold, we may increase of the lowering of the under our nose to a system of gold, as the export of gold, more weight the gold was half-an-ounce would only be the other half our fixed price, as then note would on other he would.

SECONDLY—

price, it is to sustain the industry, counter, as to rices of the la

SIR R. PEEL TRA  
RAPALING OF

The petit and those noble classes chosen British prince to there is the but whether it is given to repudiate American flag sometime that Grey. In the torn is being administration dispeated to our American was assured, minds us of traveller who up his torn to scribble the ed ministered to language.

stating, far interest is at once succeeded and in the industry of a acquired also. It looks through than its voice. Am I sake they were pro tested tyra because all commands. Never was that man is for human justice if not were the

Perkins

\* The rai homme qui et etourdi

† BRIT The fo to foreign try is a co pact to r terises th impediment

Council in the last  
it arises not from a  
ing system, but as  
MACKENZIE or my  
called to a patient  
or outward structure  
mighty river, when  
in April, 1842,  
simply two per cent.  
loyed money capital  
system, to produce in  
is, to be as certain  
is ultimately coming

next Midsummer,  
it may be exten  
months hence, or  
penny's worth for a  
value in the sense of

where freely induc  
a. There is a mind  
fearful accents in  
throughout Christian  
resistance begins !  
only inflicted in forms  
only true capital is  
of the workman  
hungry, and to be  
hours in a moment  
confidence is by  
ments with which

ally settled down in  
system was tested by  
of landlords, and  
at : the annuitant  
ive wealth—in the

and few men have  
of ruinous descent,  
fairly drawn in  
the means of safety.  
in a speech in the  
Act of 1819 as one  
d the Government  
James Graham's

ary, is a check to  
the instead of 50,  
gratulating themselves adrift. The  
the only while the  
rests fall, the  
in (money) con  
which could not be  
conditions. These

on and the politi  
and the industr  
a convertible term.

on of his bill of  
the price abroad)

cession of money  
respective without

in this country !  
legal tender (or

is the only reme  
price. In no

by our manu  
extensive demand  
always to be had  
his country. But

manily lower  
, or a quarter of  
sterling, will suit  
commodities to

indeed with our  
y of the gold  
aving TWO IN  
ances (especially

cially the in  
-

rest of our industry that the greatest amount possible of gold be imported, as extending that basis, besides the export of gold being an evidence that we are, just as the export of it is an evidence that we are not, exporting British labour. All therefore will readily perceive that we ought to prefer the sovereign as our legal tender for a pound, when the foreign price of gold is sufficiently (and it matters not how far down it goes) below £1 the ounce, if thereby we attained the two points of *preserving* gold being exported, and of *encouraging* gold being imported in the greatest quantity.

**FIRSTLY.**—On the same principle (the defence of British industry) on which Monetary Reformers, when gold tended to advance above our fixed price of £4 from sovereigns, opposed the pound sterling being at all times equal to a quarter of an ounce of gold, we meet, in the now altered prospects, resist not only any increase of the weight of the sovereign (or, in other words, any lowering of the price of gold), but while gold abroad remains under our nominal price of £4, we must prefer the present money law to a system of paper money convertible at the market price of gold, as the former tends more than the latter to prevent the export of gold. In the latter way there would be more inducement to export gold as a speculation, as the foreigner would get more weight of gold for the paper pound; for in the latter way, if the gold was worth £3 in the market, the paper pound would buy half-an-ounce of it, while in the former way the paper pound would only buy a sovereign, or a quarter of an ounce of gold. On the other hand, it is equally clear, that with the price above £4, our fixed price, the paper system would best check the export of gold, as then, with gold at £3 the ounce, the bearer of a pound note would only get 1-6th of an ounce by this system, while by the other he would demand a sovereign.

**SECONDLY.**—With the foreign price of gold below our fixed price, it is decidedly the interest of our industry that we should sustain the law as it now stands, and prefer the gold to the paper counter, as tending more to encourage the importation from America of the largest possible share of the gold now getting in Cali

fornia. The American will bring more gold here if he *cares* to get, at the British Mint, four sovereigns for his ounce of gold, than if the fluctuating market price in London were £2, for he could not rely on getting British goods equally cheap in proportion. He knows this would depend on the demand for British manufactures. The American has learned, from "Tales on Prices," that the high price of gold after 1797 did not directly cause high prices for British commodities, although the confidence arising from the internal circulation being made independent of gold led to increased demand, and, consequently, to higher prices. The price of commodities is only directly regulated by the demand for the particular articles, and (even at present the low fixed price of gold chiefly operates on prices by paralyzing our currency through threatening its export) the price of gold has an indirect and often remote effect on them to the extent it increases or decreases the demand for goods. Now (supposing wages to have risen 50 per cent., or the cloth to have risen in price to £6 6d, whose Peel or starvation price I assumed at £5), the American, if he got 4 sovereigns for his ounce of gold, could buy 50 yards of the cloth, whereas, were the market price of gold down to 50c an ounce, he being paid in paper pounds, would only get 40 yards of the cloth at £6 for his ounce of gold. Thus it is clear we should get more gold from America by sustaining our present money law, and **THIS IS VITAL FOR US**, not only as securing us larger sales of manufactures, and as a consequence larger prices and wages, but as the less gold the Americans retain to themselves the fewer will be the development of their banking system, and the less ability they will possess to hold their cotton for high prices, and to increase their manufacturing opposition to us in their own markets and those of other countries. Had the Americans not required to send away, to carry on their war with Mexico, the gold they drew from us in 1847, they could have held their cotton for speculative prices last year, and thus aggravated indefinitely our manufacturing distress in this country.

Yours very respectfully,

ISAAC BUCHANAN,

#### SIR R. PEEL OVERLOOKED THE GREAT FACT OF OUR HAVING COLONIES WHEN HE PROPOSED FREE TRADE—FREE TRADE AND COLONIES BEING THINGS INCOMPATIBLE WITH EACH OTHER.

#### RAPID ALIENATION OF THE COLONISTS, OR DEADENING OF THE EXTREMITIES OF THE EMPIRE;

The *petit émigré* statements of the present day are throwing up those noble countries called the British Colonies with the same son chagrin as they departed from the noble maxims called British principles. To the countries and the principles alluded to there is the same moral certainty of a glorious resurrection, whether this shall occur before or after these have been driven to repudiate the name of British and to take refuge under the American flag; depends on how long the national delusion shall continue that holds up such men as Peel, Gladstone, and Lord Grey. In the meantime the condition of the colonial proprietors is being made more and more desperate. Gladstone's administration of Peel's principles, and especially his celebrated dispatch to Canada, (in which, banishing from his memory all our American experience,) he boldly asserted that the Colonial tie was secured by the traditional prejudices of the Colonists; I reminds us of the treatment received by a distinguished French traveller who was shipwrecked on the coast of Barbary: to dry up his tears the Barbarians threw dust in his eyes! But to describe the effects of the principles of political economy as administered to the Colonies by Lord Grey, it is impossible to find language. The eloquent language of Sheridan, instead of overstating, far understates the case; for *so pestiferous* to British interests is the breath of our late geometrical legislation that it at once succeeds in blasting all agricultural pursuits at home and in the colonies, and at some time invigorates the national industry of our opponents and enemies, reanimating even their accursed slave trade.

It looks as if some fabled monster had made its passage through the country, whose pestiferous breath had blasted more than its voracious appetite could devour. Am I asked why these people arise in such concert? Because they were people in human shape; because patients under the detested tyranny of man is rebellion to the sovereignty of God; because allegiance to that power that gives us the *forms* of men commands to maintain the *rights* of men. Never was this unextinguishable truth destroyed from the heart that man is not the property of man; that human power is a trust for human benefit; and that when it is abused, revenge becomes justice if not the bounden duty of the injured. These, my Lords, were the causes why these people rose.

Perhaps no where has the truth as to the misgovernment of

The race of small men described by Chambaud, "Jeune homme qui se distingue par un ton decisif, par des manières libres et étourdis."

#### † BRITISH PRINCIPLES, BANISHED FROM THEIR OWN COUNTRY, HAVE TAKEN REFUGE IN AMERICA.

The following is the deliverance of the greatest living American, the Hon. Henry Clay. He terms Free Trade "Concessions to foreign powers, to our rivals jealous of our growth and anxious to impede our onward progress. Encouragement to domestic industry is a concession to our fellow-citizens. It is a concession by the whole to the whole; for every part of the country possesses a capacity to manufacture, and every part of the country more or less does manufacture." And the Free Trader or Theorist he characterises thus:—"He has mounted his hobby and has determined to spur and whip him on, rough shod, over all facts, obstacles, and impediments that lie in his way."

The colonies are in danger. The empire is parting. We are in the progress downwards, and commence our second millennium, as Anglo-Saxons, with bad prospects, unless our policy be decisively and rapidly changed.

To me it has long been clear that, whether willfully or not, Peel and Grey have, between them, as *nearly as possible*, broken up the British Empire. At all the different stages of the Free Trade Mania, I have seen its certain result; firstly, in our ceasing to be an Empire; and secondly, in our being involved in revolution from want of employment in this country; and I have not flinched from what I consider the duty of declaring that Peel and Grey, with Cobden and others, are in the opinion of the Colonists mere political cut-throats. The following are the words which I addressed to the Secretary for the Colonies, on the 11th April last,

subsequent events having but too well corroborated them—"In 1842 I brought before your Lordship and Lord Elgin the true position of the Colonies, showed that for the loss of those, the nobility of Britain's Colonies, we should have to blame entirely our own Imperial Legislation in 1774 and 1842. In 1774, we created Lower Canada into a French, when it should have been made an English, colony; and we gave the French Canadians a feudal system as a means of keeping them *different* from the New England States—which were then evincing the independent spirit of Englishmen—and as a machinery by which, with the aid of the North American Indians, we vainly imagined to hust down the then protesting Colonies, which are now the United States' Republic. I showed you that practically, to suffer a French dominion now in United Canada (even if done under the *forms* of the Canadian Constitution of 1840) would be an equally vain attempt to coerce the British portion of the American Colonies, who, though they love the British name well, love the reality of British freedom better—and I pointed out the certainty that, if the fatal policy of 1774 were practically to be persisted in by the British Government, Lord Elgin would assuredly be the last British Governor in America, it being absurd to suppose that the same causes that would lose us Canada, would not also lose us Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and the West Indies. The Colonies would be *temporarily* saved—by our repudiation of the anti-British legislation of 1774—and by this course alone will time enough be got to save our entire Colonial Empire by the national repudiation by Sir Robert Peel and his anti-British measure of 1846. Except with a view to the latter, there is no use whatever in carrying the former reform: but to leave no uncertainty by what I mean by the latter, I shall here state the practical way in which the legislation of 1846 may be so qualified as to secure permanently our Colonial Empire.

PRIZES OF £200 TO THE WORKING CLASSES OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND FOR THE BEST ESSAYS ON THEIR OWN INTERESTS.

"My principles lead me to do whatever is best for the manufacturing population, believing that in the prosperity of our artisans will be found the greatest prosperity to agriculture which it is entitled to; and believing that the difference between this and what might seem a more 'fLOURISHING STATE OF AGRICULTURE' would affect only the landowner, as reducing the value of his land and his rents. And I, of course, allow that with open ports more wheat will be imported and the price proportionately reduced in this country; but this reduction, I contend, is an evil, as lessening employment to the artisan, through reducing the purchasing ability of the home agriculturist, unless there is a fresh demand for British goods by the foreigner, to the extent which the reduction of price disables our own agricultural interest—landlord, tenant, and labourer—from laying out money in manufactures. In fact, the transaction of importing wheat paid for in British gold, instead of British goods, is neither more nor less than the rich sending money abroad for cheap food for themselves, instead of buying it from the agricultural customers of the manufacturing class—thus depriving the latter of customers, or, to speak more plainly, reducing their employment." From Mr Buchanan's 8d letter to the *Grimsby Advertiser*, dated 24th July, 1849, in reply to Mr Cobden's letter to Mr Ensor on the subject of a fixed duty on corn. Mr Buchanan's view is that our allowing our prices of food to be reduced by imports of grain from *precarious sources*, paid for in gold, is to bring Great Britain to the brink of a principle, and *leave it there*. Scarcity of grain will sooner or later arrive from one cause or another, even if our own land does not go out of cultivation; and then it will be found that though wages fall with the price of food, *lowered by an over stock*, they do not rise with it, *enhanced by scarcity*. Social convulsion amounting, and more than amounting, to revolution will be the result of such a lamentable state of things in any country. He does not wonder that the working classes are soured at and alienated from our selfish and supercilious landedocracy. It is, therefore, entirely in the selfish view of their own interests that he expects our working classes to come to recognise the great fact that food is not the *first necessary of existence*, but employment, or in other words the *means of getting food*.

"But if any over-adventurous Canadian manufacturing wight propose as a task for himself—to compete with the over-grown factory lords of England—let him first ponder well, in his own mind, whether, if it should seem to him desirable, he can starve by deputy, as these factory lords both can and do. If he cannot manage that, let him cease from the competition as vain and self-starving, as indeed the straight road to ruin; and let him admit that Canada either cannot manufacture, or if she must try—and *must* is the word—that she has no other alternative, but either to impose a protective tariff, or to have an extortive one imposed on her."—From the 4th address of "A Colonist." This is the conviction of the most patriotic native born Canadian; but as loyalty in Upper Canada is much more ardent than at home, Mr Buchanan believes that the Canadians would *yet* be brought to undergo all the sacrifice involved in the deferring of their manufacturing progress, if the tie with their mother country were immediately drawn closer, by steam across the Atlantic for the million, with advances of £200,000 to each district Canadian council, to be advanced on improvements at 6% per cent. for 21 years (thus paying up the principal gradually) in the same way as Government is advancing money to improve land at home, &c., &c., and by protection in the British markets for Canadian wheat, in return for protection in Canadian markets to British manufacturers.

It is thought well to re-publish, in this form, the following papers, including the whole of the addresses of our good friend "A Colonist," as the best illustration that can be given to our Free Trade Theorists, that the position of other countries, and even of some of our own Colonies, does not enable them (without the great sacrifice of deferring their own manufacturing progress, and losing the advantage of a Banking system as losing their precious metals) to free-trade with Britain on equal terms. These addresses show exactly the interests of Canada, which are just the same as have been so well described by a late able writer as the case of "a country with moderate facilities for the production of most things, and with extraordinary facilities for the production of nothing, the natural condition of nine-tenths of the countries of the world." (Sophisms of Free Trade examined by a Narrator.)

"Now, imagine that country under a system of Free Trade—of unrestricted imports. Except in a few favoured spots it cannot grow wheat, for Poland will undersell it (in the case of Canada, the Western States will undersell it) in its own markets; it cannot manufacture, for in cottons, hardware, woollens, and other products of manufacturing industry, England will undersell it; neither can it import its own corn, its manufactures, or its wine from abroad, for its domestic industry being superseded and smothered, it has nothing to give in exchange. It becomes then in this condition, it can neither make for itself, nor buy from abroad. It goes without, or if not entirely without, it is scantly supplied. A starving and ragged population derive a wretched and precarious subsistence from half cultivated land. It has neither industry nor foreign trade."

Our object is to do what we can to get Peel's unprincipled and fatal course appreciated before we lose our Colonies: we feel the more duty in this course because we believe most firmly that the same Legislation which loses the Colonies, and our supremacy on the sea, must lead to a diminution of employment at home & vast art to issue in political confusion, even although there exists the present loyalty to the British Monarchy, with the present universal devotion to the Reigning Sovereign. To any one who reads the Addresses of "A Colonist," we need scarcely say that he is a perfectly honest politician, and a most unprejudiced man; his circumstances, besides, place him above motives of any sort; and as to his political predilections, they are just what were those of the great and good Lord Metcalfe, late Governor-General of Canada, (who set free the press in India, &c., &c.); in a word, as liberal as it is "Colonist," would not be deterred, by fear of man, from declaring themselves Republican if such were their convictions. They are true from reason as well as prejudice to the time-hallowed monarchy of Britain, although their contempt (which they hold in common with all Colonists) for the present race of statesmen at home is scarcely less virulent than that of Buxton, when he said in words something like the following,—"I am loyal to the Crown, but to be so I do not conceive it necessary to be loyal to its ministers—to its man-servant, to its maid-servant, its ox, or its ass!" They do not believe that a Republican or popular Legislation is at all incompatible with a strong or Monarchical Executive. A Monarchy, they say, may recognize and practically carry out with honesty

\* See Mr J. W. Gamble's exposure of the Economist—page 11.

[How to Save the Colonies.]  
Let us at once prove our faith in Free Trade by making the Colonies as far integral parts of the British Empire as to levy no duty on the sugar, corn, or other products of the Colonies, except on articles on which there is an excise duty in this country; and let us in order to show our confidence in British manufacturing superiority, and to lead other nations to reciprocate with us to a reasonable extent—desire by the same act of Parliament that all foreign countries that will agree to *Free Trade with our Colonies*, and so to remodel their tariffs as not to charge us more on any article than 15 per cent. on the British cost, shall stand on the same footing as the Colonies, and have their products received here *free of all duty*. And, as it is most reasonable that countries which will not agree even to such terms of reciprocal trade should have deducted from the price which their articles produce in this country a 'customs' duty in some degree equivalent to the taxes paid by British subjects producing the same articles, let us arrange that on all such foreign articles as are not charged any duty, or are charged a less duty than 15 per cent. on the price in England, we should charge the same 'customs' duty of fifteen per cent. until the foreign country agrees to our proposition for reciprocal trade, or until we agree to such other proposition as the foreigner may show to be more reasonable in his peculiar circumstances. By following the foregoing line of principle and policy, I am confident the Colonies and the West Indies could, in a moment, be reconstituted into the most prosperous and most loyal portions of the British Empire. I see also, however, that it is most likely that our national institution may continue till, in the British Colonies in 1850, as in France in 1848, the melancholy words, 'It is now too late,' may come to be used; and, in such case, the names of Peel and Gray will go down with infamy to posterity, as having reversed the old British principle that Honesty is the best Policy."

the  
acting  
since  
with  
which  
the  
page  
topic  
  
An  
have  
the  
amor  
and i  
Colo  
West  
On c  
Toro  
exten  
of th  
manu  
them  
to th  
diffus  
nial  
are t  
and  
best  
quest  
Mr A  
M.P.  
Mr  
rises  
Canad  
deposit  
relied  
and h  
Mr B  
ern C  
feels  
occurred  
drawn  
and i  
inter  
motive  
prize  
L.P.  
To  
view  
in the  
ing t  
they  
est o  
at o  
he ha  
he ha  
quoted  
ELL  
Octo  
has n  
the a  
oppo  
But  
the o  
(as b  
Prot  
for t  
that  
mon  
Stat  
We  
progr  
tere  
wor  
amor  
Vi  
follo  
Eas

by making the Colonies as to levy no duty on imports, except on armaments; and let us—mettreing superannuation and so on to a reasonable amount that all foreign Colonies, and so on to any article than in the same footing. We have free of all articles which will not be paid by Britain in this country a customs paid by Britain. I arrange that on all articles, or are charged in England, we should wait until the foreign trade, or until we longer may shew to us. By following the confident the Colonies reconstituted into the British Empire that our national colonies in 1850, as now too late, may of Peel and Grey having reversed the policy.

## BEST ESSAYS

ity of our artisans seen this and what his land and his only reduced in this purchasing ability reduction of price. In fact, the trans- h sending money to—thus depriving or to the Colonies. Mr BUCHANAN's gold, is to bring cause or another of food, lowered unting, to revolution classes are sourced own interests at employment, or e over-grown face can starve by and self-starving—and must be on her.—From loyalty in Upper pro all the sacrifice drawn closer, advanced on im- advancing money in Canadian

good friend "A. and, even of progress, and loss. These addresses the case of "a of nothing, the spots it cannot sets it; it cannot tell it; neither d smothered, it broad. It goes precarious sub-

es; we feel the r supremacy on here exists the who reads the in; his circum- of the great liberal as it is his friend the ms. They are only hold in com- o said in words to ministers— dation is at all t with honesty

the principle of the greatest benefit to the greatest number; and such they view to be the best government of a country, just as acting under the Law of Kindness, an authoritative head is a blessing to a family, for the loss of which other expedients but feeble states. They think it is passing sentence (especially in these Revolutionary days) on Monarchy to admit that it is incompatible with democratic or popular legislation—while it is equally to condemn Universal Suffrage, to suppose it incompatible with the firm administration of the Law, after that law has been framed by means of the machinery which is generally admitted by themselves to be the best to indicate the People's interests and feelings. These views were expressed in Mr BUCHANAN's letter to Lord George Bentinck, on the breaking out of the Continental Revolution, and published at the time, dated New-York, 25th March, 1849 (see page 16). It will be observed that he did not mean to say that he expressed the views of the individual protectionists, but the protectionists views which could alone hope for success.

(From the *Greenock Advertiser*, of February 8, 1850.)

Among the intelligence by the American steamer, we have in one very gratifying item enough to show that the true "never say die" feeling will ever be uppermost among the Anglo-Saxon population of British America, and that under whatever government they may be, these Colonies will neither sink under their miseries like the West Indies, nor yet allow themselves to be Iroelandized. On our first page will be found the particulars from the *Toronto Colonist* of 11th ult. of an offer of prizes to the extent of £.100 to be competed for by the working men of the British Isles for the best essays on the following questions:—"Whether does a policy of centralizing the manufacturing arts in Great Britain, or one of diffusing them through the Colonies, offer the greater advantages to the working people of the British Isles ? and is such diffusion more likely to be attained by a system of Colonial Protection, or by one of Free Trade ?" The essays are to be given in to the judges by 1st January, 1851; and the donor, a gentleman connected with one of the best known families in the West of Scotland, has requested, it will be seen, his Grace the Duke of ARGYLL, Mr ADDERLEY, M.P., and Mr ISAAC BUCHANAN, late M.P. for Toronto, to act as judges.

Mr BUCHANAN has just called at our office, and authorizes us to state that he will, on account of his friend in Canada, pay the money as soon as it is required to be deposited to await the decision, so that the thing may be relied on as certain to go on, whether the other judges and he accept the office or not. It is well known that Mr BUCHANAN considers it barely possible that the Western Colonies can be saved to the empire; he therefore feels the more gratified at an opportunity so unexpectedly occurring to get the attention of our home population drawn to their Colonial interests before it be too late; and he farther authorizes us to say that, impelled by his interest as a Canadian proprietor, as well as by higher motives, he will add £.100 to the donation—so that the prizes will be for £.200—probably eight in number—viz., £.75, £.50, £.30, £.20, £.10, £.5, £.5, £.5.

To prevent any misunderstanding of Mr BUCHANAN's views, we ought here distinctly to mention that he joins in the present enterprise merely because of its encouraging the working classes to judge for themselves; as, if they do so—his principles leading him to place the greatest confidence in the intelligence of our operatives—he has no fear of the result. On the subject of Free Trade he says the working classes were never consulted, and quotes, in corroboration, the authority of EBENEZER ELLIOT, the Corn Law Rhymers, who wrote on 17th October, 1849:—"It is remarkable that Free Trade has been carried by the middle classes, not only without the assistance of the working classes, but in spite of their opposition."

But Mr BUCHANAN does not approve of the wording of the questions, in as far as they encourage the fond but (as he says) foolish hope that, without the principle of Protection being adopted for the empire, with Free Trade for the Colonies and reciprocating countries, it is possible to retain the Canadas and the West Indies. He says that so far is this from his conviction that he believes that the American States would not remain united six months under a system of Free Trade, even though these States are countries lying contiguous to each other.

We shall hereafter have great pleasure in reporting the progress of the farther arrangements about this most interesting competition, and we trust that the intelligent working classes of this town and neighbourhood will be among the successful competitors.

We should not be at all surprised to see the example followed (as it was with Mr HENDERSON's Sabbath Essays) by other parties deeply interested in a true un-

derstanding of the now pressing question of Colonies, and to find the prizes in this way greatly added to in number, if not in their amounts, which seem already abundantly handsome. In such case the form of the questions may be varied with general advantage, as well as in order to make them more applicable to the condition and capabilities of other Colonies.

## PRIZES OF £100 TO THE WORKING CLASSES OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

(From the *British Colonist* of Toronto, of 11th January.) We beg to direct public attention to the letter in another column of our correspondent "A Colonist."

The subject of protection to Colonial manufactures is there brought forward in a form more attractive to the English operative than any that we have hitherto seen.

"A Colonist" proposes to give prizes of £50, £30, £20, for the three best Essays on the following question:—"Whether does a policy of centralizing the manufacturing arts in Great Britain, or one of diffusing them through the Colonies, offer the greater advantage to the working people of the British Isles ? and is such diffusion more likely to be attained by a system of colonial protection, or by one of Free Trade ?"

The competitors are to be working men of the British Isles. His Grace the Duke of Argyle, Mr Adderley, M.P. for North Staffordshire, and Mr Isaac Buchanan, late M.P. for Toronto, are requested to act as Judges. The essays are required to be given in to the Judges on or before the 1st January, 1851.

## ADDRESS

TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE ASSOCIATION OF UPPER CANADA FOR PROMOTING THE ARTS OF AGRICULTURE AND MANUFACTURES.

If we Canadian farmers would avoid annexation, and would lend a hand to prevent disastrous wars between England and the United States, and paraventure to save the British Isles from utter degradation and ruin, we must adopt the language of President Taylor's last Message to Congress, and apply it to Canada. We must—"viz., by due encouragement to manufactures, give a new and increased stimulus to agriculture, and promote the development of the resources of our common country." President Taylor adds, immediately after the words above quoted:—"Believing that to the attainment of these ends (as well as the necessary augmentation of the revenue and prevention of frauds) a system of specific duties is best adapted, I strongly recommend to Congress the adoption of that system, fixing the duties at rates high enough to afford substantial encouragement to our own industry, and at the same time so adjusted as to insure stability." The Secretary of the American Treasury, in his report of December, enforces these views of the President by detailed statements, and by arguments that are irresistibly conclusive.

When Great Britain has, in the relations of commerce, put her Colonies upon the same footing with foreign countries, the presumption is, that the policy of foreign countries towards Great Britain, is the policy which the Colonies ought to adopt towards her—especially when foreign countries are unanimous—and that without combination or conspiracy, but each being solely guided by reference to its own national interest, and that presumption is strengthened into proof, when our neighbours of the United States, having tried more than once the present commercial policy of Canada, and having uniformly failed in these trials, and having tried more than once a protective policy, and having uniformly succeeded in these trials, have, after these two-fold experiments, firmly resolved to maintain, and for the last eight years has maintained, the latter policy, and under it have, in spite of great and well known drawbacks, advanced beyond all example in population, wealth, and power.

In the language of President Taylor, encouragement to manufactures is required, to "give a new and increased stimulus to agriculture, and to promote the development of the resources of our common country."

In other words—Canada needs manufactures, and to get them she must impose such duties, not only on Foreign, but also on British manufactures, as shall give adequate assurance of profit to manufacturing enterprise in Canada, by guarding it from exposure to overthrow, by floods of imports—the production of an union of labour, poverty-stricken by over-competition—with a capital, real and artificial, of an amount so vast as to have been as yet enabled to crush all attempts at revolt on the part of its crowded and pauperised task servants; and which, by means of their exertions, has agrandized itself to the utmost pitch that accumulation has yet attained, at rates of profit far advanced towards the infinitesimally little—far advanced beyond any point to which, on this continent, for some generations at least to come, the most sanguine avarice may hope to reach.

The policy that promises benefits to the Canadian farmer, holds

## FREE TRADE AND COLONIES THINGS INCOMPATIBLE WITH EACH OTHER.

out like prospects to the British artisan. It cannot be that he is benefited by having the Colonies shut out from his occupation, and by having himself chained to the workshop of his smooth tongued taskmaster; yet these are the results of the policy of "free trade." The Factory Lord well understands that cheap bread means low wages. Liberty to the avaricious strong, is oppression to the needy weak. The Colonies being prevented from manufacturing—and the British workman being treated as an alien in the United States, even after he becomes a nominal citizen—it follows that there is no country using his own language open to his skill and art—but that he is bound to his "cheap bread" master in England. Open to him not only Canada, but all the British Colonies, and while he is spreading the arts of civilization over the whole world, he will secure to himself at least a fair day's wages for a fair day's work; and by relieving a miserable over-competition, will secure the like blessing to his fellow artisans left at home. Instead of being used as an instrument for ruining the farmer, and filling the poor houses at home, he will in the Colonies, while providing for himself, enrich his agricultural neighbours, and at the same time will co-operate in laying the foundation of a system which must relieve the British Isles of the reproach of able bodied pauperism. He will assist in converting the industrious pauper himself into a reliever of poverty.

Now, as of old, knowledge and wisdom lead to riches and honour; but if our sole aim be riches, let us ask ourselves how we can hit by dealing with beggars. Are not those who are either already in the Poor houses of England, or are fast wending there, our real customers? The Merchant and the Lordly Manufacturer—are these our customers, or are they not rather the mere Brokers of our Exchange with the scantily paid and competition jostled labourer and the pauper?

The Economists cry aloud for cheapness—but where is the beauty of their cheapness? Where, but in cleanliness of teeth? If price be the representative of labour, degrade the representative and you degrade the constituent.

When all the world around is rising or rattling with the hurly burly of reform, has the doctrine of *price* reached perfection? Has Manchester got it? And are all attempts to ameliorate the condition of man, by opening new fields for his industry, skill, and genius, to be met and put down by a Cuckoo Retailer's cry of "buy in the cheapest and sell in the dearest market?" Are not buying and selling, taken in the main, only two parts of one operation?—i.e., the operation of exchange; and in one and the same transaction is the giving of a good bargain inconsistent with the taking of such? Nay, to keep good customers is it not needful to give them good bargains? We do not ever that a Retail dealer may not by either tacit or open falsehood both buy cheaper and sell dearer than the fair trader for a few days or months, say more than we deny that a man may fill his pocket at the expense of his neighbour, by directly breaking the eighth commandment;—but neither of these kinds of operations is on the whole profitless, and in both, the better the customers become acquainted with each other, the less mutual antipathy is there between them. To get and keep good customers—these are the objects of successful trade, and the only mode yet found out for attaining these objects is to give good bargains.

But admitting, for the occasion, that the lowest grade of Retail Merchants may be guided by the ready reckoned maxim—"Buy in the cheapest—sell in the dearest market"—are Nations and their administrators to be so guided and governed—and is that peddling maxim so captivating that it sway must be extended to prevent the *making* of markets? If the markets which we already have are proved to be bad, and if we have it in our power to make others, and these good,—are we to be stopped from exercising that power, and to be confined to making the best of the bad markets that we have?

We must be a singular people indeed, if we cannot make better markets than those which we have four thousand, or four hundred

thousand miles away. We have the power for making these at hand, and must not Great Britain reflect whether, if she refuse as liberty to make them, the power of attraction at 400 miles' distance (New York) will not prove greater than at 4000 (London).

If Wheat and lumber (Timber) form almost the entire list of our exchangeable productions, while our soil is proverbially fertile, our water-power vast, and distributed with infinite prudence, as well as beauty, over all parts of the land, and our climate healthful and invigorating to the body and to the spirit of man, is it just to ourselves, right to our fellow-creatures, and grateful to the Giver of all these good gifts, that we cry content to the continuance of this our barrenness, and humble ourselves to be the willing instruments of insatiate avarice, aggrandizing itself by playing the hypocrite of philanthropy,—saying out for conventional boxes with all the world, and cheap bread to the poor and needy, the more effectually to inveigle these to that proximate famine, which is the sure index of its own luxurious opulence.

Can any but the dullest intelligence deny, that in the circumstances of our exchangeable productions being almost entirely confined to wheat and lumber, there is a clear indication, that we either are deficient in enterprise, or have our energies misdirected, or that we suffer under both of these causes of depression. The first of these alternatives is disproved by a crowd of witnesses. There has been no end to our bankruptcies. The unnatural course of our exchange, and the juggling finance of England, have been too strong for our clearest-headed merchants.

The second, then, is the cause of our unproductiveness, and if we continue our degraded adorations to either the universal free trade Diana of Manchester, or the more circumscribed Jove intended to lead to annexation, what improvement can we expect? or after our soil is unprofitably to us worn out by our unnatural exactions from it of wheat, and after we have given away as a thing of nought, the noble crop of our forests, the growth of bountiful centuries, and when we shall at last discover our mistake, how shall we answer to our children for its consequences?

Cannot all but the very blindest—that is, those who will not see—perceive that with us there is really no practical and beneficial question between free trade and protection. Is it not transparent to Canadians, that the former can only be transient—that it is shortly to be or is now—only used as a stalking-horse, by the way of annexation, to carry England forward to the mark of freedom from commerce, with *United North America*, and bearing a charge to bind Canada with fetters of iron, to the chariot-wheels of Boston and New York.

The true and substantial question for Canada to consider is, whether she is to have real and express protection in alliance with Great Britain, or express but no real protection, *vis à vis* annexation; whether she is to have moderate, but adequate protection, enjoying the benefit of her customs dues, under her own management, together with the advantages that must follow upon the establishment and advancement of manufacturing art and industry; or whether, under the name of high protection, she is first to be subject to the levy of enormous customs dues, and then to have the management of these engrossed by foreigners, and their proceeds transferred to a nominal protector, but actual extortions, at a distance of 800 miles,—and for a climax of the compliment, so coveted by some of the downiest of her offspring, to have an hope of a now attainable advancement and elevation in the arts, prostrated and held down, by the adverse interests of an already powerful and avarice-ridden rivalry.

Let it be pondered how unenviable will be the responsibility incurred by Canada, if possessing the arbitership of empire, she with a heart full of spite and of treachery, to her country and kind, shall discharge herself of her high office, by an award of which this must necessarily be one count, *viz.*—that "No one spot on this continent will remain, on which a native of the United Kingdom can rest the sole of his foot, and say he is the equal of any other man." Do not these few plain and true words

<sup>†</sup> The contrary opinion to this is at present unashamedly circulated by the Manchester School. Although the great argument of the Anti-Corn-Law League was that they wanted cheap food to enable them to manufacture cheaply, and thus beat the world, the understandings of the Working Classes are now insulted by being assured of the exactly contrary doctrine—*viz.*, that there is no connection between prices and wages! When our shrewd working men, whose general political knowledge is far in advance of the middle classes, turn their minds coolly to this particular point, they cannot fail to see how shamefully they have been humbugged by the cry of "cheapness." If "cheapness" does not lead to more general employment in this country, all men admit that it must prove a curse to our industrial classes; and if cheapness were, by possibility, to lead to an increased demand for labour, this would just as quickly upset the theory of "cheapness," for it is not increased demand the mother of money "dearness," or, in other words, of increased wages and prices? Let the working classes take warning by the fate of the landlords, and avoid a narrow view of their interests. The Landlords thought they could have dear grain and cheap commodities of which they were buyers! Let us be warned by their failure. In my "Cries of Sir R. Peel's Mission," I described the miserable position of the landlords (page 24.)

To understand what Sir James Graham actually meant when he, in the passage referred to, denounced the Corn Bill of 1815, I must continue my quotation from his excellent pamphlet. It will be observed that Sir James declared his conviction to be that our true and honest policy is a fixed duty such as Lord John Russell proposed in 1841. "Let me implore, therefore, the landowners to abandon the futile attempt of artificially maintaining high prices under the ancient standard; let them make a timely compromise with the public, and take an ample, but fair protecting duty, with open ports, on the admission of foreign corn—**A DUTY EQUIVALENT TO THE BURDEN IMPOSED ON THE PRODUCE OF CORN IN THIS COUNTRY, TO WHICH THE CONSUMERS OF CORN ARE EQUALLY LIABLE**; and, on the same principle, a drawback on exportation may be obtained. This concession will win back the friendly feelings of the people; and let not the landowners lose this great advantage: let them rivet the gratitude of the community to their cause; let them exert all their power, and insist on the revision of Mr. Peel's Act of 1815—an Act not less fatal to the landowners than to the payers of taxes—an Act now about to come into full operation—an Act which, from its first introduction, loaded the people to insurrection; and the returning influence of which has not failed to produce the same alarming consequences. Heretofore the landowners may with safety make their stand; the position is impregnable; the payers of taxes, the productive classes, are ready to defend it; substantial justice is on our side; and who are they that are against us?—the ANNUITANTS, the FUNDHOLDERS and the ECONOMISTS; a body which the landowners, if true to themselves, and in concert with the people, cannot fail to defeat."—Sir James Graham's Pamphlet on Corn and Currency, published in 1827.

at hand,—  
as liberty  
exists (Now

list of our  
nally fertile,  
providence, no  
nate health-  
man, is it  
grateful to  
the con-  
sidering itself by  
convention  
and needy,  
state famine,

the circum-  
entirely  
cation, the  
ergies mis-  
depression,  
owd of  
The unan-  
ness of Eng-  
roharts.

ness, and if  
diversal free  
cribed jad-  
we expect  
unnatural  
n away as a  
growth of  
rever our  
miser-  
equences?

who will not  
and bene-  
t not trans-  
ient—that  
are, by the  
d of free-  
d bearing a  
bit-wheal

consider in-  
alliance with  
nnexation;  
tection, en-  
n manag-  
ow upon the  
nd indus-  
she is first  
and than to  
, and their  
xtortioners,  
impliment  
to have all  
in the arts,  
an already

ponsibility  
pire, she  
ntry and  
award of  
"No one  
ve of the  
he is the  
re words

gument of  
world, the  
ere is no  
one of the  
parged by  
it is the  
ower, this  
in other  
a narrow  
years! let  
page 24.)  
of 1845.  
be the  
ndowners  
compre-  
DUTY  
WHICH  
ion may  
t advanc-  
of Mr  
peration  
failed to  
geable;  
against  
consent

emand a hearty pardon, from frail men to a frail man! A parchment one is got already. [They are the words of W. Lion "Kenzie.]

England may become greater than ever, by spreading the arts of civilization in her provinces, and thereby over the whole world. A merely nominal free trade, which robs her productive industry and her productive capital at home, and which is raising rebellion in many of her provinces, must first be abandoned. The dark places of the earth must be enlightened, and the habitations of savagery exposed. But, for dark spots and cruel habitations, England need not look beyond her own shores: the poor girls that stitch the cheap *blouses*, have to eke out a livelihood by Rahabism:—these modern deliverers of the Jerusalem messengers, have to do as she of Jericho did. There is not a viler idolatry than the idolatry of cheapness. Economy of labour is good—economy of prices is bad. Other appreciation is a false balance. \$20,000,000 were paid to the West India planters:—one million would send 100,000 manufacturers out here. Rather than enslave them, were it not better to send them here, to do their part towards enlarging the land, and water, and wood of Canada. Immigration on a large scale must be orderly. Manufacturers must come first. These once established—immigration may come "rough-and-tumble."

I am thoroughly convinced that the establishment of manufacturers here will be for the advantage of the holders of productive property, and of all the working people in the British Isles. I believe, these working people need only to have their attention strongly directed to the subject, in order to their being brought to the same conviction. Endeavouring to give this direction, I would follow the example of Mr Henderson, of Park; and I trust that the offer here to be made will elicit a like spirit, as well as a like ability to those displayed in the "Essays on the temporal advantages of the Sabbath to the working classes."

I propose as a subject of essay for the working man of the British Isles:—"Whether does a policy of centralizing the manufacturing arts in Great Britain, or one of diffusing them through her colonies, offer the greater advantage to the working people of the British Isles; and is such diffusion more likely to be attained by a system of Colonial Protection, or by one of Free Trade."

For the best essay on the above subject, I fix, myself, to give £50; for the second in merit, £30; and for the third, £20.

The essays are to be sent, by the 1st day of January, 1851, to such place as shall be directed by the judges.

I request His Grace the Duke of Argyll, Mr. Adderley, M.P. for North Stafford, and Mr. Isaac Buchanan, late M.P. for Toronto, in Upper Canada, to be judges. And I would take the liberty of humbly, but strongly recommending to His Grace, and to the gentlemen whom I have named, that upon them the colonies have a peculiar claim:—upon His Grace, because of all the British Peers, there is none so closely connected with the people of the colonies, by patriarchal and ancient territorial associations as he; upon Mr. Adderley, because former political services have by immemorial usage, passed current as promissory notes for future performance; and upon Mr. Buchanan, because of his intimate acquaintance with colonial affairs, and of his well-known character in Canada for honesty and sagacity.

Steps will be taken forthwith to bring the above proposal before the British public. In the meantime, I beg to recommend it to the notice of Editors of newspapers, in order to their giving it extensive publicity.

A COLONIST.

#### THE POSTULATES OF "A COLONIST."

The foregoing address, which offers three prizes to the working men of Great Britain in the 8th of a second series of addresses. We give the first of this second series below as containing his "postulates." This embraces all the leading ideas of the author as regards the advantage to, and absolute necessity of, Canada becoming a manufacturing country, except one, viz., that manufacture in Canada, through increasing the tide of emigration to British America, would afford the ships outward freights from the mother country, and would thus cheapen the immense freight which Canada now has to pay on her exports on account of the great proportion of the vessels having to come from England in ballast.

The patriotic views of "A Colonist," who is a large landed proprietor farming his own land in the neighbourhood of Toronto, differ not, as to his ultimate objects, from those of our old correspondent, his friend Mr. Isaac Buchanan now of Glasgow, but only as to the means of the attainment of these. The simple objects of both are—1st. The greatest prosperity to that portion of her Majesty's subjects who have settled, or may hereafter settle, in British America; 2d. The preservation of the supremacy of England over the different colonies comprising British America (if this can be made compatible with the great-

est prosperity to these countries, as otherwise, of course, it is impossible, and, if possible, would be injurious); both gentlemen being quite satisfied—after a mutual experience of twenty years of these magnificent countries—that the unlimited extension of field afforded by them for the degraded working masses of Great Britain will hereafter be deemed sufficient ground for the impeachment of any minister who may be instrumental in throwing them away, even if Britain had an independent supply of timber, a necessary of national existence, elsewhere (which she has not), and even if it were no object for Britons to have the degradation pointed out in the "Colonist's" feeling quotation:—

"No one spot on this continent will remain, on which a native of the United Kingdom can rest the sole of his foot, and say he is the equal of any other man," the British workman being treated as an alien in the United States, even after he becomes a nominal citizen.

Mr. Buchanan has written more than any other man on the necessity of protection—not because England could not do with Free Trade if other countries would imitate her example, but because no other country on earth but England is in a position to open its ports—and this is also the view of "A Colonist." They agree, too, in declaring that without protection our Western Colonies must be immediately lost to the Empire; but the "Colonist" goes farther and shows that CANADA MUST PROTECT HERSELF AGAINST ENGLAND! He attempts (and we think with extraordinary success) to show that it is for the obvious interest of every country so situated to manufacture for itself, as well as grow its food. He shows, in fact, that Canada must have manufacture, and that to manufacture a system of protection is a sine qua non.

"A Colonist" has long thought that if the attention of the intelligent working men could be got to examine the vast and rich field that the Colonies present for their occupation, that the cause of Free Trade would fall, but not till a few weeks ago did the idea of a prize or prizes occur to him. In order, however, that there might be no fear, that every fair play should be had by competitors holding convictions on the subject of Free Trade, contrary to those of the donor, we observe he has appointed as judges two free Traders, and only one Protectionist. There are three enlarged views long held by Mr. Buchanan, which will probably become very popular, (especially as taken in connection with our present subject) with the working classes of Great Britain.

1st. Steam for the million across the Atlantic; 2d. That every country and colony should have paper money, and that the advantage of the circulation should be taken from the rich, who do not stand in need of it, and given to the poorer classes, if this can be done with safety—not only as a direct benefit, but as a means of individual banking capital which the richer classes also monopolise at present. He would induce the industrious classes to take stock in New National LAND BANKS, whose notes he would make a legal tender (thus giving the poor interest on the money in circulation); the whole capital he would invest in improved lands, to be let in small parcels, at rents to yield 5 per cent. on the cost, (the stock holders having a preference); and it would be always in the option of any holder of this stock, which might be termed "People's Consols," to get legal tender notes advanced to him on loan at 5 per cent. to the extent of one half his stock, the national LAND BANKS not having the privilege of advancing on any other security but their own stock, and that to the amount of only one half the amount invested in land. Such a system, Mr. Buchanan thinks, would get as once into confidence, especially if this People's bond were, as he would suggest, a copartnership between the Government and the people; all Crown Lands in the respective countries being thrown into the joint stock, the Crown, however, getting no return till the private stockholders had received 6 per cent.; and in order to its adoption, he does not see it at all necessary directly to interfere with the existing Bank of England, or other banks in England, Ireland, Scotland, and the Colonies. He says that the legal tender notes contemplated would go out gradually to the extent the system acquired public confidence, or rather the confidence of the working classes, and that to the extent the notes of the National LAND BANK of England, Ireland, Scotland, or the particular Colony, were issued, the notes of the Bank of England and the present banks would be displaced, leaving these latter only to fill up any deficiency of the circulating medium, which they would always be prepared to do at all times.

3d. Mr. Buchanan views the public lands as the birth-right of the working classes of Great Britain—the lands in the Colonies being the only thing they have to represent the national expenditure gone to in conquering and defending them. He would therefore insist on **EVERY BRITISH SUBJECT HAVING A RIGHT TO LAND IN THE COLONIES GRATIS**. He has often written details of such a system of colonization, and we shall subjoin the last of these sketches,

\* Presided over by a new member of the Cabinet, whom Mr. Buchanan proposes calling "the Minister of Employment." These LAND BANKS, if made to include the Crown, would be a small embodiment of the Constitution, for Mr. Buchanan's idea is from what Lord J. Russell has said that those who are afraid of *Universal Suffrage* may at least agree to add to the present constituency the name of every man who has been a stockholder, for twelve months, to the extent of Five Pounds in the National Land Bank.

† SECRET OF COLONIZATION—SWEEPING RUMORS OF THE COLONIAL OFFICE—AND A FREE GRANT OF LAND IN THE COLONIES TO EVERY BRITISH SUBJECT THAT CHOOSES AND IS ABLE TO EMIGRATE.

(As it appeared in the *Toronto Colonist*,—April, 1845.)

To Ireland and the British Colonies there must be a NATIONAL SYSTEM OF COLONIZATION under a new Cabinet Minister, whom I

would call the MINISTER OF EMPLOYMENT with the co-operation of the principal Secretaries of State for the Colonies, who should be not less than four in number with distinct departments—say the North American department, the Australian department [including the African Settlements] the department of India East—and the department of India West—to be called

which was published in the *British Colonist*, in April, 1846, being part of Mr Buchanan's letter, dated New York, 26th March, 1846, to Lord George Bentinck, on the breaking out of the Continental Revolutions being heard of in America.

In conclusion, we would just notice one of the many very shrewd remarks of "A Colonist;" in one of his addresses after showing that Canada must manufacture—and repeating that *must* is the word—he thus appeals to the Canadian manufacturer on the impossibility of his being able, unprotected, to compete with the Manchester millowner. "You can neither starve persons;" nor by proxy; the latter, the Manchester cotton lord can and does do."

#### ADDRESS—I.

To the President of the Association of Upper Canada for Promoting the Arts of Agriculture and Manufactures.

I believe that the want of success of Canadian enterprise, and

Secretary of State for the Northern Colonies.

Secretary of State for the Eastern Colonies.

Secretary of State for the Southern Colonies.

Secretary of State for the Western Colonies.

I am far from believing that the foregoing machinery, each Secretary having the assistance of two under secretaries, [*nature of the particular Colonial Department*, whom I shall refer to below] will be found at all adequate, a few years hence, to the important duties, the proper performance of which would realize *good government to the Colonies*; and from this may be gathered my idea of THE TOTAL INADEQUACY OF THE PRESENT DEPARTMENT IN DOWNING STREET, as the Colonial machinery of a great empire whose life's blood is

"Ships, Colonies and Commerce," and not the mere "Manufacturing Commerce" of the Free Trader, or mere Manchester man. The country should look to the new department for the accomplishment of a DISTINCT AND COMMON SENSE OR PRACTICAL OBJECT, such as the extension of the country's exports—not less in any one year, above the former year's exports, than one million of pounds sterling—with a similar increase of the productions in the British dependencies of cotton and other raw material essential to our manufacturing independence and supremacy, or as I expressed it in March, 1846, "So systematising matters that, through the labour of a British colonial population, we will each year be getting more and more cotton, more wheat, more timber, more sugar, more sheep's wool, and all other necessaries, PAYING BRITISH LABOUR FOR THEM, AND NOT BRITISH GOLD, AS AT PRESENT." By means of practical government like this we should find ourselves very little dependent on foreign trade, which however would be sure to woo us the more, the more we become independent of it; and thus would we be the blessed instrument of bringing independence to the door of every industrious family in England, an independence which could be relied on *at last* as long as our repudiation of reciprocal Free Trade and our determination to adhere to the great principle of patriotic self-sufficiency as opposed to the Cosmopolitan doctrines.

IN IRELAND THE SUBJECT OF COLONIZATION IS ALTOGETHER A MATTER OF LOCAL CIRCUMSTANCES, and one which my local knowledge does not fit me for entering into, farther than to say, that I should very much prefer to set on my friend, Mr Smith, of Deanston's, professional opinion, as to the possibility of reclaiming the Irish lands, than to rest satisfied with Sir Robert Peel's well known official *dictum* on the subject. Of THE CAPABILITIES OF THE COLONIES, I KNOW ENOUGH TO REFUDATE, AS UTTERLY WITHOUT FOUNDATION, AND THE MERE CREATURE OF INDEPENDENCE, THE IDEA THAT THE COLONIZATION SUBJECT IS SURROUNDED WITH INSURMOUNTABLE DIFFICULTY. I think that all the difficulty lies in the ignorance and want of hands (and heads I had almost said) in Downing Street; and I should feel the colonization enterprise half effected—upon the principle that a thing well begun is half finished—when the views and principles held by Lord Stanley, and most other Colonial Ministers, were thrown overboard. After being nearly twenty years a colonist, I feel confident in asserting this as the universal feeling in the Colonies. I would give a free grant, as his birthright, to every man in Great Britain, Ireland, and the Colonies, of 100 acres of land, in whatever colony he chooses to go to and remain in as AN ACTUAL SETTLER; thus at once would a gleam of hope and self-respect be thrown into the darkest breast in Manchester or Glasgow, while a MOTIVE TO ECONOMY would be furnished to every man, in gathering together sufficient money to convey his family thither. In justice to the colonists, as well as to furnish me a means of knowing that there exists in the man the energy necessary for a settler's struggle, I would assist no settler till he arrived at his land; when I should furnish to those whose (well authenticated) circumstances required it, agricultural implements and food for the months that intervene till he can get his first crop (but no money), all this being done on a self-supporting principle, the land still being retained in security. I would gradually raise a million or two millions of pounds sterling in London by the creation of a new debt called COLONIZATION FUNDS [secured not only by the Home Government's credit, but by the whole lands of the colony where the money is applied]. With this money I would prepare HOMES IN THE WOODS for the different grades of emigrants; and I would form a corps of experienced colonization agents—men of the profession of farmers—to be scattered throughout the Colony to secure to the emigrant disinterested advice, and to put WITHIN HIS REACH ALL THE INSTRUCTION WHICH THE GREATEST PRACTICAL EXPERIENCE CAN FURNISH. I could put my hand on hundreds of practical and experienced men to answer the above des-

cription pervading the minds of Canadians are chiefly to be ascribed to the absence of such a variety of employments as is needed for the profitable exchange, and other convenience of the population at large, and as is suited to the various tastes and capacities of its various members; and I further believe that a proper supply and distribution of occupations are essential to the prosperity of any people. I am, moreover, convinced that a remedy of the evils which press on the enterprise of the country cannot be provided by individual exertion, but only by the co-operation of the body politic through the Legislature. Therefore I feel it incumbent on me to lay my convictions before the public. Before venturing to do so, I have endeavoured to make the consideration of them easy and unencumbered, by reducing them to a shape as formal and abstract as they would bear. I earnestly crave attention to them, and that if approved of, they

cription in Canada, who would, for a very small annual consideration, [beyond a grant of land,] transfer themselves to the new districts, about to be laid open, as the heads of these settlements; and I have no doubt the same thing would be as easy in all other Colonies to men locally acquainted with them as I am with Upper Canada.

Guided by no consideration but the great interests of the empire, I would, without any hesitation, appoint to JOINT COLONIAL SECRETARIES OR STARS in London, men of genius, and combining parliamentary talent with the Colonial experience; and for this work my men would be the Honourable Robert Sullivan, and Joseph Howe, [at present Prime Ministers of Canada and Nova Scotia, respectively,] to preside over the northern and southern colonies, leaving the present able under secretaries, Mr Hawes and Mr Buller, to apply themselves to the eastern and western colonial departments. Over these men I would allow no supercilious lordly master, any more than I would tolerate the interference of any slow-moving Downing-street clerk, cumbered with old musty forms and senseless precedents.

Thus we would throw a simultaneous glow of confidence into the now deadening extremities of the empire, just as your lordship with Lord Ashburton, and Mr Herries, if placing yourselves in the breach of the constitution at the present crisis of its fate would *calm in one moment the troubled heart of the empire and of the world* by being able to announce that following your noble example Lords Clarendon and Palmerston [incomparably the ablest men in England] having come and laid their personal antipathies on the altar of their country, were prepared to undertake the foreign and home departments of the government. Lord Palmerston should be at the Home Office, if not Prime Minister. Although it is all important to have the benefit of his Lordship's experience in foreign affairs, it is self-evident, that a man equally firm, and, if possible, more determined on the right course, yet, at the same time, more cool, and less committed, [combining in a word, the *savoir-vivre* in modo with the *fortiter in re*,] is required, arbiter of the world's destinies at this juncture.

ENGLAND AT THIS HOUR IS CERTAINLY ON A COURSE OF DECLINE, and with empires like individuals, their downward course is rapid—"facile est desensus Averni."

To enable us to fix on the cure, we must first ascertain the causes of England's decline, and prominent among these will stand out the misgovernment and want of government of the Colonies by which England has been prevented being benefitted by her foreign possessions, and has been made in too many cases a curse to them. Then we will find, in pursuing our inquiry, that the *uselessness* [of our own creating] of the colonies was availed of by an unpatriotic [cosmopolitan] combination of cotton Lords in Manchester to excite the people in favour of Foreign Trade, on which there is no dependence, in preference to the Home and Colonial Trades which our legislation has the power to retain to feed the industry of England. Poor John Bull therefore finds himself [more frightened than actually hurt as yet] in the predicament of the rich old invalid, whose disease—serious enough if continued—is that having deviated from his good old principle of *living within his income*, and thus had his LABOR INDEPENDENCY slightly invaded, he already realizes himself a beggar. My view of the only course open to this country, was fully explained in a paper, headed STATEMENT OF PROTECTIONIST VIEWS AT THE OPENING OF PARLIAMENT, which appeared in the *Glasgow Reformer's Gazette*, in January, 1847, a number of which newspaper was sent to every member of both houses of the Imperial Parliament as well as the Colonial Legislatures. And I still feel satisfied that ENGLAND HAS YET AT COMMAND THE ELEMENTS OF GREATNESS AND HAPPINESS IN A DEGREE POSSESSED BY NO OTHER COUNTRY IN THE WORLD, as I am satisfied that [set free from the circumstantial disadvantages of her church and aristocracy, and able to retain the disinterested social influences of these noble and time honoured institutions] England has an executive government admitting of the prompt and independent execution of high designs, and containing within its capabilities at once of progress and accumulation, to a greater practical extent than does the principle of any other government whatever. I see that her subjects may enjoy every advantage of democracy which a Republic offers, while they are saved the natural evils of democracy which are inherent in a Republic. And as the first or one of the first steps to centralizing the productive energies of England, I would make the COLONIES INTEGRAL PARTS OF THE EMPIRE. They should have their name even in common with the mother country and with each other. And BRITAIN IN AMERICA, should not only be bound to Great Britain, but to BRITAIN IN INDIA EAST AND WEST by every tie which common interest, as well as common glory can create.

are chiefly of employments convenience of their tastes and believe that a majority of the country only by the contrary. Therefore before the time to make it, by reducing would bear. I proved of, they

annual considerations to the new settlements; as in all other cases with Upper

confidence into your lordship yourselves in its fate would be and of the noble example by the ablest of the antipathies undertake the former. Lord Palmerston's Minister's man equally at course, yet combining in it is required.

OF DECLINE, course is rapid

to ascertain the of the Colonies by her cases a curse

and Colonial made, on which

and to feed the finds himself in the edification of if continued

of living not slightly view of the in a paper, KING OF PARIS Gazette, in sent to every

at ENGLAND

to a greater

government

dvantage of

the public.

And a productive

INTEGRAL

their name

each other.

Great Brit

ry which

may be acted on; and with profound humility I would add that I am satisfied such action cannot begin too soon.

#### POSTULATES.

1. It is expedient for a country to manufacture for its own use all kinds of articles, which when manufactured are of primary necessity to its people.

2. It is more expedient for a country to manufacture so much of its own rude products as of those like productions in a manufactured state, as are fit for its own use.

3. It is still more expedient for a country so to manufacture, when supplying such like productions in abundance, and being able indefinitely to increase them, it also possesses large natural powers and facilities for such manufacture.

4. It is yet still more expedient for such a country so to manufacture, when otherwise it must draw its supplies of such manufacture from, and in exchange send its own rude, bulky, heavy, and perishable productions to a market, or markets, not only distant, but which are for a large portion of the year inaccessible.

5. It is expedient for a country to adopt measures calculated to provide honest employment for such of its people as are not fitted, or not needed for merchandise, and for the few trades which even the rudest agriculture requires to have at hand, and who are also unaccustomed to agriculture, whether by reason of want of bodily strength, or of adverse habits acquired, or of natural temperament; and as each of these conditions is consistent with even extraordinary aptitude for occupations of manufacture, it is expedient for a country to promote the establishment of manufacture within its own bounds.

6. It is expedient for a country to promote the establishment of manufacture, because the development of manufacture advances the quality, productiveness, and profits of agriculture, as well by holding out inducements of enhanced gain to such advancement, as by disseminating knowledge whereby such advancement may be assured, expedited, and extended.

7. It is expedient to promote the establishment of manufacture, because the advancement of agriculture to follow thereon must promote greater developments of manufacturing skill, enterprise, industry, and other capital, and because these will produce reaction beneficial to agriculture.

8. It is expedient for a country to promote the establishment of manufacture as powerful instruments of forwarding and increasing internal communications, and other improvements for the benefit of the public, and especially of the inhabitants of the interior.

9. It is expedient for a country to manufacture for itself, because by agriculture without manufacture the soil is impoverished, and thus a permanent and real capital is sacrificed to a temporary and fallacious interest.

10. It is expedient for Great Britain and Canada to promote the establishment of manufacture in Canada,—for Great Britain, in order to provide a field for the profitable occupation of a portion of her surplus manufacturing population; and for Canada in order that she may import customers to enhance the value of her surplus productions, and not merely competitors to diminish that value; and that, along with customers, she may import a practical knowledge of those useful arts in which she is deficient.

11. It is expedient for Great Britain and Canada to promote the establishment of manufacture in Canada, because without

\* Since we send men to Washington to get reciprocity for Canada, why not do the same for England? Every practical man in the American trade knows that the way to support the Free-trade party in the United States is our taking American produce free, conditionally on their not charging us over 15 or 20 per cent. on any British article. In the meantime, I would put 15 per cent. on every article from the United States, only deferring the cotton duty one-half for three years, and the other half for 6 years.—I. B.

#### THE QUESTION OF PROTECTION CONCEDED BY "THE ECONOMIST."

CANADIAN DISCONTENT AND DEPRESSION—ANNEXATION.—Such is the title of two Editorials in the *Economist*, in August. \* \* \* Of this journal, the writer was formerly a great admirer; from its pages he has derived much useful information, at one time regarded it as a sound guide in questions of political economy, and with many others looked upon its commercial articles as almost oracular; but having learnt to mistrust the dogmas of Adam Smith—having seen the foundation on which (See Cary's "Past, Present, and Future") Ricardo based his celebrated theory of rent, utterly demolished, he has of late found it necessary to bestow closer attention upon the writings, and exercise greater caution before receiving the opinions of the great advocate of *Laissez-faire*.

The article alluded to asserts that farmers and millers in Canada favourable to annexation, adopt that plan from an opinion of its necessity, and as a countervailing benefit, contingent upon our colonial condition, points to the protection on Canadian timber in the British markets. The *Montreal Herald*, to add strength to the annexation cause, successfully shows the superiority of the United States as a market for that staple, thus rendering valueless the only commercial advantage remaining to us as a colony, and leaving the argument of necessity, as stated by a subordinate minister of the Crown, to exert its full force in favour of annexation. \* \*

I hold that, to insure continuous prosperity to Canada, consumer and producer must be brought still nearer—placed side by side, and that the mode to accomplish this, and to aid the farmer in inducing the mechanic to take his place beside him, is a high protective tariff on all those articles for the manufacture of which we possess natural advantages. The editor of the *Economist*, this subordinate minister of the Crown, the great free-trade advocate of England, admits, as his deliberate conviction, that the only relief, the only refuge for the depressed agricultural and milling interests of Canada, is to be sought and found—where? Why, in the markets caused by the "protected corporations of New England." Here it is:—pointed out by the *Economist* as the only source of relief, annexation excepted, for the agricultural and milling interests of Canada, is to be found in the markets caused by the protected corporations of New England. Wherein, then, we differ? Protection, as a system, is equally the beneficial cause of the remedy, whether that remedy be attained by annexation, or by the more subtle mode, of the free ingress into the United States of our natural products, promised us by the *Economist*, by treaty of Reciprocity. The difference is just this: I say, and common sense says, and the facts and reasoning of the *Economist* say, adopt yourselves the policy of the Union, and your protected corporations will soon furnish you with a market of your own, for your agricultural products at home.

The *Economist* says, free-trade with the Union in raw produce makes their high prices yours, but, true to England's interest, neglects to add, then will we gather those high prices into our own bosom, in exchange for the rags and devil's dust of Manchester and Leeds. No, no, Mr *Economist*, England must consult the interests of her people abroad equally with those at home—they are no longer to be gullied with such words as "British subjects" and "integral parts of the empire." They have the shadow—they want substance; she must consult their interests, or they will consult them for themselves. ANNEXATION IS FAR PREFERABLE to your "free trade in raw products," unaccompanied by protection to home industry; and I submit whether the question of protection is not virtually conceded by this free-trader?

then Canada cannot be prepared for independence, and because the law of dependence, if Canada be rigidly subjected to that law, must drift her to another dependence than that on Great Britain, and one antagonistic to it, and consequently THE PREPARATION FOR INDEPENDENCE IS A FUNDAMENTAL CONSTITUENT OF ANOTHER CONNECTIVE.

12. It is the duty of Canada to establish, and of Britain to promote, the establishment of manufactures in Canada, because to neglect doing so would be to disregard the good gifts of Providence—disobey the divine command to subdue the earth, and to leave unimproved those opportunities of making discoveries useful to man, and honourable to his Maker, for which every land has some, and Canada many, and great special qualifications.

Having thus stated twelve good reasons for the establishment of manufactures in Canada, I must add, that Canada cannot establish manufactures for herself, except by means similar to those by which other countries have established them for themselves, viz.: that it is impossible for Canada to establish manufactures otherwise than by adequately taxing imported manufactures.

1st. Because she has not the requisite amount of skill, and cannot get it otherwise than by encouraging it with a protective tariff.

2d. She has not available capital, and cannot get it otherwise than by encouraging it with a protective tariff.

3d. She has not adequate manufacturing organization, and cannot get it otherwise than by encouraging it with a protective tariff.

These three wants will be surely supplied by adequate protection. With such protection supplies will spring up within the country, and be imported without the country. Partial supplies of skill and capital will not then be, as they now necessarily are, exported or dissipated in consequence of the want of such protection; nor the partial supplies of organization already in the country kept down, and crushed by the adverse interests of the importing merchants,\* acting through the monied institutions, which are almost entirely supported and consequently are controlled by the importers.

#### A Colonist.

\* How true a picture this of the baneful effects of foreign merchants in England on our politics, although they are as foreign in their interests as the produce in which they deal.—I. B.

#### REMEDIES NOT IN THE POWER OF THE COLONISTS.

##### ADDRESS—No. II.

Those remedies proposed, which we cannot of ourselves apply, are 1st, Britain's returning to her old protection; 2d, America's granting us free trade with her; 3d, a union with the sister Provinces; and 4th, Annexation to the United States.

[As the more immediate object of this publication is circulation among the members of Parliament and the press of the United Kingdom, our friend "A Colonist" will readily concur in the propriety of our omitting the details of his second address, the more especially as this is required to prevent the leaving out of the subjoined admirable corroboration of his view by his esteemed neighbour Mr Gamble—a gentleman who is a native Canadian, and of the highest standing. It is taken from the Canadian papers.]

## REMEDIES WHICH THE COLONISTS CAN APPLY.

## ADDRESS—No. III.

I propose now to consider and compare the most prominent of the classes of remedies proposed for her alleged evils, which Canada has in her own power to apply.

They are two in number. They are, in nature and tendency, in the extreme opposition to each other.

The one rejoices in the *sous le guerre* of "Free Trade with all the world." The other proposes to rouse up workmen for the cultivation of those useful and necessary arts in which Canada is undoubtedly and greatly deficient, by means of duties to be imposed on imported manufactures—duties, which it is alleged, will, at the same time, afford the means best calculated for the convenience of the country, of paying its debt and current expenses, and of extending its public improvements. It takes the less liberal name of "Protection to Home Industry."

The one is a new fashioned importation from Manchester—pretty—but by the abovementioned judges of all countries, save one, pronounced filthy and rotten. The other is a homelier article, but of world established reputation for tear and wear.

The one has for its authority—that pseudo-national school, of which Mr Cobden is the well paid master, and Sir Robert Peel the most noted disciple. The other, the unanimous concurrence and practical approbation of the Statesmen of all civilised nations in all ages—fresh raised, or late converted, save those already described, of the present day in England.

The question having arisen, which of these two schemes to prefer, and having to be settled too, either simply, or by annexation, (which would settle it with a vengeance on the free traders)—the lovers of free enquiry in Canada must, in examining their merits, feel thankful for the effulgent light which has lately been shed on the Manchester Emanation, by a politician so free from obsolete prejudices as Mr Boulton, Member for Toronto.

The masterly, practical, and straightforward—the singularly candid exposition, which Mr Boulton has given of the Manchester philosophy, must open the eyes of all those who have profited in their opportunity of reading his explanatory letter, addressed to *Mr. Boulton*.

I do not, for I certainly cannot, claim the least merit as due to Mr Boulton, for any display in that exposition of grandeur and originality of genius, but for shrewdness in perceiving the true and practical drift of the Cobden system, and for his happy application of it to the circumstances of Canada, what man of right feeling and the most ordinary judgment can deny him the palm of supremacy.

Then, although so lucid and unmistakeable in meaning, there

The advocates for protection against foreign competition hold that by subjecting foreign manufactures to the payment of a high duty on importation, domestic industry is thereby stimulated to produce manufactures at home.

Thereby furnishing mouths to consume upon the ground the productions of the earth, and supplying a home market to the farmer. [—Note by *Isaac Buchanan*—Had they all remained farmers, as our Free-traders want them to remain, the United States would be no better than Ireland and the countries on the Black Sea which have "cheap" food but no arts or manufactures.]

That a home market so caused, yields higher prices and is subject to little fluctuation, that if the farmer does pay a little more for his clothing, under a protective policy, he and the rest of the community benefit a hundred fold thereby.

By an increased price for their produce.

By an enhanced value for their property.

That the free admission of foreign manufactures in a young and agricultural country, necessarily compels mechanics (consumers) to become farmers (producers), thereby converting valuable customers to the farmer, in their proper vocation, into his rivals in a market already glutted with surplus production.

That prices are not only low but unsteady, when regulated solely by foreign demand.

That freight and commissions are unnecessary waste, out of the pockets of the producer, to be avoided by consumption on the

Vaughan, Canada West, Oct. 22, 1840.

is not a syllable in it to offend the most fastidiously delicate ear. It is so gracefully and decently worded. From beginning to end "smuggling" never once occurs; and the most accomplished parrot, on hearing it read, could have no idea of its real reach and bearing.

At once, having introduced his borrowed engine, the Member for Toronto lays it bare, and points it straight at the mark. The next point of the object of attack is exposed—the necessity to which the United States Government is subject, of maintaining its Tariff, is at once pointed out, in order to establish and define a position for Free Trade *auant*.

Next the palmy days of Prescott, Niagara, and Amherstburg, in July 1834, are sung, and their present shrunken leanness and degeneracy lamented. Their 1834 prosperity is ascribed to the "immense business done with the United States in Broadcloths, and other British Manufactures." Then their downfall is traced to the deplorable facts of, 1st, the improved manufactures of the United States under a protecting Tariff, and 2d, the increase of provincial duties imposed to pay the interest of our debt. And then comes the cool reflection. "Had the low duties (2½ per cent.) continued, a large and profitable business would still have been carried on at an immense profit to this country."

The argument in immediate sequence is—"If, then, such a trade flourished in the article of broadcloths almost exclusively, with a duty of 2½ per cent., what has since occurred to prevent an immense increase and continuance of such trade, if we can offer them in our towns the productions of the world free of any duties whatever?" In such smooth and decent words is the doctrine of smuggling preached.\* Now, reader, bear in mind that this is not Mr Boulton's doctrine, but Mr Cobden's doctrine, and Sir Robert Peel's doctrine—truly and simply developed and illustrated by Mr Boulton. We continue the quotation, which gets clearer and clearer. "Would any Merchant living east or west of Albany, ever think of going to New York or Boston to purchase foreign produce, with from 15 to 40 per cent. duties added, when they could at all our frontier towns, purchase the same articles free of duty." Fancy a cool calculation with a Q. E. D. understood at the end that there shall be found no honest merchant east or west of Albany! None to save New York and Boston from ruin, by purchasing a single foreign product, at either of these doomed cities! Not one! How thankful Mr Cobden and Sir Robert Peel should be to Mr Boulton for taking this invidious explanation business off their hands!

And who so barefaced as deny Mr Boulton's to be a legitimate and correct explanation of the Manchester theory as applicable to Canada? Mr Boulton riots in it. Tastes are various.

The *Economist* says:—At present Canada has the advantage of importing the manufactured goods and the products of Europe, subject only to the small revenue duty of 7½ per cent., upon which, in the United States, high protective duties, varying from 25 to 40 per cent., are levied for the benefit of the Corporations in New England.

But in the United States, it must be borne in mind, is an immense home market. They have a population of twenty-one millions, a large majority of whom are consumers, and not producers of grain. It therefore frequently happens, that in those parts of the Union the price of grain is regulated exclusively in respect to the home demand, for which it is worth more than for shipment.

There too (in the Union) wheat, except when it is very high in Europe, commands a price from 20 to 25 per cent. more than on the Canadian side of the lakes and rivers.

It is under these circumstances, that wheat frequently is from 1s 6d to 2s higher on the American side of the St. Lawrence, than on the Canadian.

It is this circumstance which has added so much to the value of property on the south side of the river and lakes, compared with the north bank.

On the other hand, Canada has a population of one and a half millions, nearly all producers of grain.

To find a market for the surplus, after supplying the markets of Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick, they must resort to Great Britain. Their prices, therefore, are always regulated by those of this country.

Making due allowance for freight and charges.

J. W. GAMBLE.

\* Mr Isaac Buchanan, whose knowledge of commerce in general, and of Canadian affairs in particular, and whose honesty and real ability must command respect wherever he is known, brought the free trade policy to its *reductio ad absurdum*, when he showed the necessity in maintaining it for Great Britain to resolve herself into "a National Committee for Smuggling!"—A Colonist.

Mr Boulton reasons the result of such a policy would be "almost beyond calculation," almost, nay—we admit it would be so quite, for who could calculate the result of the whole length of the St. Lawrence being made a smuggling hell—meeting and exceeding all within its reach.

But with all his partiality to the Manchester doctrine, he does not overlook one objection—only one. What, is that smuggling? Pooh, nonsense. What then? "Aversion to direct taxation." Truly an universal aversion. Nay, on that account it is the key to the cry for direct taxation. How? because that cry proceeds from the importing merchants, upon whom that which is called direct taxation presses less directly than that which is called indirect.

Let us examine shortly and succinctly the merits of these two systems of taxation, called direct and indirect, and, 1st, in point of economy, must not that which is called indirect be the cheaper, inasmuch as it is more easy of accomplishment, by means of its dealing in the gross—and consequently requiring a greatly smaller number of hands than the other, which deals in detail, and more especially in a country of so thin and scattered a population as Canada is? 2d, in point of morality—if fraud be necessarily connected with the levying and paying of taxes—were it not better to have two men, corrupted in one transaction, amounting to \$100, than 100 men in 100 transactions, amounting to that sum?—Again—if fraud be not necessarily connected with the gathering and paying of taxes, will it not be easier to find two men proof against it, than to find a 100 such? 3d, in point of social convenience, will it not be more comfortable for the members of society, that there be in each frontier town one tax-tavern, than that every private dwelling in the land be made an inn for the tax-gather?

Further on Mr Boulton informs us that "in this colony, were all duties abandoned, our farmers would not only be exempt from taxation, but would enjoy the necessaries and luxuries of life cheaper even than the Americans." Luxuries of life, not only plenty of blueberries, but almost as cheap! Cheap, cheap—oh, happy farmers: and no taxes to pay! Paradise regained.

But of one thing Mr Boulton has not informed us:—a thing which Mr Cobden, or Sir Robert Peel really should, either themselves or by deputy, explain to us, ignorant Canadians—namely, how, when the defeating of the American tariff, which they complete, shall have destroyed American manufacturers, and when the destruction of American manufacturers shall have brought down the price of American farm produce to the level of Canadian, or lower, how, I say, in these contingencies, is Canada to be supplied with the flow of American capital which their exponent, Mr Boulton, has promised us? If the fruit tree be cut down, what more crop can we look for it to grow? And if the rewards of agriculture are to be curtailed by a diminution of price, how is the farmer to be benefited? Does not the farmer mean here simply Canada? Are we not called a purely agricultural country? Lower the price of farm produce already, according to Mr Cobden's exponent, ruinously low, and "profit this country immensely!" Why, Mr Boulton, the whole population would be swallowed up by the floods of Bankruptcy, except such as should incessantly run away.

Has not Mr Boulton here entered a prose jockeyed Parnassus-nag, to compete for the prize of grotesque absurdity with the exquisitely nursery rhyme—

"Three children sliding on the ice upon a summer's day,  
As it fell out they all fell in, the rest they ran away.

Let this scheme put forward by Mr Boulton be none other than that of Mr Cobden, and Sir Robert Peel, only divested of ambiguity, and exhibited in not quite, but almost naked simplicity.

Mr Boulton is as happy in his calculations as to the overflowing of the Public Exchequer as in those he has made for the benefit of the individual farmer. Wheat being, by his own showing, at present not to be raised without loss, while the United States market is, in consequence of their manufactures, available to Canada. Destroy these manufactures, and that market fails both to the Canadian and United States farmers. Why, then, neither we nor they shall produce at all. Therefore, the canals will be unused, and the Exchequer filled with only "hundreds of thousands" of no dollars, the proceeds of no tolls.

Hitherto this scheme has been examined in an almost exclusively economical point of view; now let us take a peep at its moral aspect. And first, I earnestly observe, that cannot be economical which is immoral, for "honesty is the best policy." Alas, Mr Boulton does not read the true lesson from the contrast he draws between the condition of Prescott, Niagara, and Amherstburg in 1834, and that of these places in 1849. They are poor now, says he, and were rich in 1834; abandon, then, the present system, he infers, and return to that of 1834. That is Mr Boulton's lesson; but the true one is, Dishonesty leads to Bankruptcy.

And if it be true that "evil communications corrupt good manners," and that the poor imitate the rich, and especially in their vices, what a contamination will Free Trade with all the world spread north and south, from the "dangerously rich" shores of the St. Lawrence. And if the den of smuggling be pitiable in 1849, as compared with their condition in 1834, what a smash they will suffer from the new 1834 to the new 1849.

Avarice is ever imprudent with all its prudence, but if they had ears to hear, and hearts to understand, would it not be prudent for the economists of the Cobden school, especially those of

those who, like Mr Boulton, maintain an "unwavering attachment" to England, to bairn and to reflect how our neighbours to the south will think, and speak, and act, when the Cobden swine is attempted to be dug into them; when they see a string of respectable, smiling swindlers, established all along their northern frontier, and hear them preaching universal peace, and universal free trade, after the pattern of the Manchester apostle, while all the time they are casting their nets for robbing the Washington treasury of its haul of import duties, and laying their schemes for driving American manufacturers out of their own market, and reducing the price of American farm produce to the foreign market standard, and lowering, and lowering that standard to the zero point,—whether would the actions of these obnoxious disciples be disapproved, or their opinions approved of the more? Canada surely has no cause to be in her power,—universal free trade would certainly do the business. It would command the whole United States in favour of it, and animate that entire confederacy to the fighting point to attain it. And on the north side of the St. Lawrence, what honest man could, or would, stand up for a government whose fundamental policy was that of the swindler,—and what sort of a holdfast for Great Britain would the rogues make? Are they not already against her? and may not English free trade, if long persisted in, turn out to mean the freeing of England from all foreign trade, beginning with united North America.

Now, would not plump and plain annexation be better than the universal free trade scheme, if it be only assumed as a mask; and if it be adopted bone fide, so to speak, would not only filthy momentary shower both of annexation be better than playing the gin horse, and wallowing round and round, year after year, in the smuggling salts, till a Canadian Merchant Prince got rich enough to fertilize an oxen bed by merely jumping over it.

I think I have sufficiently shown that the Manchester Diana of free trade with all the world, would neither enrich the Canadian farmer nor the public treasury of Canada; and if a gang of smuggling merchants should, by it, rise for a little season to great power, and spread themselves like green bay trees, yet would even their riches speedily pass away, and if sought for, not be found.

Upon the whole, then, I would humbly contend, that it could not lead to the prosperity of Canada, for her to take up, the position of commercial pimp, and common smuggler for all the world.

A CONCERNIST.

#### PROTECTION TO NATIVE INDUSTRY.

##### ADDRESS—NO. IV.

Let it be admitted, that the departments of industry in a country, and the minor divisions thereof, ought to be directed, established, and maintained, in harmony with the power which should regulate its exchange—it follows that if that power does not regulate it equitably and judiciously—if that power be hostile, ignorant, or otherwise disqualified—it should be reformed, so as to discharge its functions in conformity with equity and judgment. If such reformation cannot be effected otherwise, it is the duty of legislation to effect it. If it be urged that Canadian legislation cannot effect such reform, the answer is, that it has never been tried. Such being the state of the case, is it a wonder that lawyers, traders, tavern-keepers, and all the tribes of the home local generation swarm as they do. Until such reform be fairly tried, and the trial fail, how can it be maintained that Canadian legislation is not able to effect such reform? Shall we conclude, without the proof of trial, that truth in any case shall fail of being established?

The first argument that I shall urge in favour of Canada giving legislative protection to her home industry is, that by doing so, she will clear a field for the occupation of the various talents of her people. The mind of man cannot be idle. If barred from useful and innocent occupations, congenial to its various phases in various individuals, forthwith it slides—at first imperceptibly, then plunges impetuously into various courses of ruin and vice—or at best whiles its time away alternately in palied indolence and feverish over-exertion. The most urgent work is done as *Bœus*, and not done well. The less urgent is left undone.

Farming is an occupation, less, it may be, congenial to man than soldiering, and yet volunteer Dugald Stewart's drill sergeant declared that he would rather inculcate the noble science of self-defence, by gun and bayonet, upon ten blockheads than upon one philosopher. A similar superior docility might be found in ten Canadian farmers.

The poor Justices of the Peace in Canada are blamed for the vexatious multiplication of taverns. As the tavern-keepers, however, are only the executioners, so the magistrates are only the administrators of the capital penal law to the moral man. The impious law itself will be found in the ignorant omission of wise industrial legislation on the part of our lower legislators, or in the wilful commission of unwise restraint on the part of our higher.

My second argument is, that protection to home industry will encourage an orderly, a great, and an increasing immigration, to the mutual benefit of the people of Canada, of the immigrants, and of the industrious workmen left in the country or countries of emigration.

Of immigrants the great bulk must be poor. Poverty is the great mother of emigration. The skill of the immigrant is all

his acquired wealth—skill in manufactures and skill in agriculture—these are the two staples of immigration capital.

In many articles of wood, some of iron, and all or nearly all, of broom corn, Canadian artisans enjoy a natural protection. The manufacturers of these flourish, and inasmuch as they flourish, they benefit the farmer, as a drop of water refreshes the parched tongue. They are at most thimblesful. But in a country where, with an axe and spade, a man may put up a lodging in two or three days, he may, after providing himself in board, have no indispensable demand to be supplied, but that of clothing.

Skill then in the manufacture of clothing, and in the cultivation of food, being the main supplies brought by immigration, it follows that we must regulate our supplies to meet the demands which those induce—and if they cannot be met otherwise, they must be met by appropriate legislation.

Agricultural skill is not in demand, because it is not remunerated for want of a fair exchange of manufactures. How can it, when most of its surplus, rude, heavy, bulky and perishable productions, have to be carried 400 miles, and the remainder 400 miles away, and the return of exchange carried the same distances—all at the expense of the Canadian farmer?

And when the tendency of Britain's policy is to make wheat now, alas! almost our sole surplus product—cheaper and cheaper, must not the exchange be getting worse and worse for Canada?

Consequently agricultural skill cannot be in proper demand, and will not, until we have an internal exchange and the regulation of it.

The skill of the manufacturing immigrant is still less in demand. Some coarser articles of wool, by extraordinary frugality, and that economy which the strictest and most thoroughly interested superintendence provides, may be manufactured with a small show of profit on a year's balance sheet. But is it not known that the manufactures of clothing here do not thrive? Do not the importers trap them, both by their importations and at the banks? Nay, are not the importers compelled to do so?

But some person says—"Mr so and so, the woollen manufacturer, tells me he can make such and such coarse sheep-like fabrics, in defiance of foreign competition." Of course he is tempted to say so—he has a bank account.

The West Indian interests brought petitions against Emancipation from "the negroes themselves." The manufacturers may be disinclined to boast of their mental affinity, to the swan-like deliverers of the Roman capitol, and their confessions of success may be interpreted as modest disclaimers of such affinity.

In order to the establishment of manufactures, there is required Legislative protection, and that obtained, manufacturers will be established—manufacturers will migrate hither. They will flourish, and will supply the demands, and demand the supplies of farmers. Both then will thrive. Labourers in numbers undecidable, agricultural and manufacturing, will be required to subdue the vast inanimate powers of nature—the earth of Canada, now waiting for and inviting subjugation. Residents and Immigrants will rejoice, like armies meeting to fight a common enemy—and a miserable competition over competition in the countries of emigration will be relieved. A great step will be gained both here and there towards the disenthraling of the minds of one class of men, and the bodies of another class, from the respective bondage of avarice and penury.

Thirdly. Protection to home industry will operate not only to the increased, but also to the improved production of agriculture. Wheat being now the only grain that can be cultivated to the smallest profit in order to exportation, and our present mode of exchange requiring an enormous amount of exportation, it follows that wheat is cultivated in conditions of soil which render it unsuitable—in conditions which, with a judicious system of exchange, would compel other cultivation, and such as would suffice to preserve and improve the fertility of the soil.

Again, wheat being the only agricultural production cultivated for export, and the only one cultivated in excess of the wants of the country, when it fails, whether by frost in winter, or mildew in summer, the farmer's loss is much greater than it would be if he raised a variety of productions for exchange, and such variety would be much more profitable to the producer, but for the expense of transportation.

The United States protecting both their agriculture and their manufactures, their farmers produce pork cheaper than Canadian farmers do; and to foster a ruinous and degraded lumber trade, United States pork is admitted at a rate of duty so low as to plunder the Canadian farmer of his own market, had as it is—a duty which has been imposed at so low a rate, on the ridiculous pretext that Canadian farmers cannot feed pork fat enough for lumbermen.

Has not Canada a natural monopoly in supplying the United States with lumber? If so, would it not be advisable for her to take duty on the north side of the St Lawrence, instead of paying duty on the south? Canada's lumber goes to the States, leaving little or nothing in Canada, but the refuse of the wages of a corrupted labour, paid in American pork and American whiskey, and the commination of a haggled down factorage.

Impose protective duties, and after manufactures are estab-

lished, there will follow a variety of farm productions adapted to home exchange, improving both the cultivation and the fertility of the land.

Fourthly. Protection to home industry, by encouraging immigration, will facilitate the exportation of our surplus agricultural productions, and thereby both cheapen to the farmer the cost of such exportation, and render it more profitable to shipping. The reason of the present heavy cost of freights of export is to be found either in the want of freights of import, or in their unprofitableness. Encourage immigration, and there will be abundance of profitable freights of import.

Again—paradoxical as it may seem—such protection will lower freights in favour of the Canadian farmer, by actually increasing the importation of British manufactures. If Canada be benefitted, as she must be, and as the United States have been, by the establishment of home manufactures, her surplus agricultural productions, while they decrease in *comparison* with those of her productions required for home consumption, will, with her advancing prosperity, *positively* increase. The articles of import, under protection to home industry, will be different from those imported now, in their assortments, but both in value and in bulk they may be expected to increase.

Increased importation of commodities, as well as of immigrants, must therefore follow protection to home industry, and must necessarily decrease the enormous cost of freights of export, under the burden of which Canada now labours. Free navigation is a specious but not the real remedy for lightening that burden. Profit is a better bait than freedom for catching mariners.

Fifthly. Protection to home industry will tend to promote education, industrial, mental, and moral. 1st. Industry undoubtedly is, in a great measure, regulated by the prospect of reward. The best way of insuring profitable industry is to insure it a fair and profitable remuneration. But without employment industry and reward both fail. The present want of employment in Canada, we have already shown. We have shown its cause, and we trust also its cure. 2d. Mental.—The prospects of a farm, and of raising wheat, wheat, wheat, at 3s a bushel—paying labourers from 8 to 12/- per month—or of toiling and trudging with saws and planes—or of a blacksmith's shop, with a tavern at hand to drive dull care away, are the sole prospects of the bulk of Canada's youth, under the present policy. Do these prospects afford sufficient encouragement to mental exertion? If nothing beyond these prospects is to be realized, is it not to be feared, that with many an aspiring youth the cultivation of his mind may prove other than a blessing? The progress of education in the common schools of Canada is truly surprising; but if a variety of definite and desirable marks were presented, how much these would tend to the attainment of desirable ends, and how much they would direct the aims and stimulate the exertions of the youthful mind! With protection to home industry, the general prosperity of the country might be expected to be such that education would occupy the greater portion of the time of boyhood; and sheer poverty in parents would not here be apt—as has, also, how often been the case in other lands—to prevent the developments of genius. Here let us hope it could not then be said or sung—

Chill penury repressed their noble rage,  
And from the genial current of the soul.

3d. Morally.—The law of human improvement provides that one attainment necessitates efforts to further attainment—one step towards the mark for the prize of our high calling, forbids looking behind, and demands further advance. Let men avoid disobeying that law, as they fear to become castaways.

The admirable system of general education, now working in Canada, will lead to the depravity of the youth of the country, unless occupations are provided to suit their elevated aspirations.

These suggestions I put forth, with a hope of their being found sufficient to induce inquiry and reflection, and to animate unprejudiced minds to favour and adopt the policy of protection to home industry.

The number of arguments, and of good arguments too, in favour of that policy, might be increased, and illustrations and demonstrations simplified indefinitely. The arguments already stated, however, with such others, not here included, as are suggested in the "Postulates" contained in my letter, inserted in the *British Colonist* of November the 2d, I consider more than sufficient to lead to the conclusions indicated.

But if any over-ambitious Canadian manufacturing wight proposes as a task for himself—to compete with the over-grown factory lords of England—let him first ponder well, in his own mind, whether, if it should seem to him desirable, he can starve by deputy, as these factory lords both can and do. If he cannot manage that, let him cease from the competition as vain and self-starving, as indeed the straight road to ruin; and let him admit that Canada either cannot manufacture, or if she must try, and *sweat* is the word—that she has no other alternative, but either to impose a protective tariff, or to have an extortive one imposed on her.

A Colonist.

\* Certainly "Order is Heaven's first law." An orderly emigration! This were the greatest heaven the British workers can enjoy on earth; and, if manufacturing colonies were first attempted to, a population to grow their food in Canada would soon follow. Canada's name, I have long ago said, should be *BRITAIN IN AMERICA*, and with "steam for the million across the Atlantic," the above would be no more than sending people from one county of Great Britain, where they cannot live, to another where they would enjoy entire independence, besides being a blessing to their neighbours abroad and their friends at home.—ISAAC BUCHANAN.

SUPREMACY  
NATIVE IN  
MISTS OF  
PRECARIOUS

"If the  
should  
of nations,  
tain even  
perfect re  
present M  
the countr  
plete or a  
general a  
nauts a  
drones of t  
dictate adv  
cise a sim  
voice in th  
backward  
laboriously  
individual  
ings and  
chained by  
do to evol  
on these s  
understood  
to which  
jealousy, n  
From th  
and di

"A man  
get subjec  
labour, ha  
in fact, ha  
"The so  
ing classes  
power agai  
constituted  
Great Brit  
stances the  
honest and  
popular pa  
of the fixe  
volutio  
My com

Sir.—Th  
away, b  
stances, b  
agricultur  
besides se  
The happy  
buted to th  
tension of t  
the incubu  
which at t  
slow death  
is quite cle  
the true e  
chuse, hav  
perhaps, ha  
country; e  
country; e

\* It is  
would object  
Earl Grey  
members;  
press, we i  
therefore o

† Thou  
among th  
principle, i  
sprung up  
to the Mos  
have a co  
arield in re  
evident dea  
he so far w  
honour and  
tolerably w  
no other pu  
its organiza  
reproach to  
Able, but a  
ingly giving  
lantropic a  
share its tr  
poor; the 2

## DEMOCRATIC LEGISLATION THE ONLY ALTERNATIVE LEFT US BY PEEL—TO SAVE THE EMPIRE.\*

DEMOCRATIC LEGISLATION THE ONLY MEANS OF RETAINING OUR NAVAL SUPREMACY, OF PRESERVING OUR COLONIES, AND OF SAVING OUR NATIVE INDUSTRY FROM THE IRON GRIP OF THE POLITICAL ECONOMISTS OR MONEY-POWER. POLITICAL ECONOMY HAS ALWAYS DEPRAVATED UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE.

"If the unhappy prejudices that now exist on this subject should continue, and if the extension of representative government should increase the power of public opinion over the policy of nations, I fear that commerce may not long be enabled to retain even that degree of freedom that she now enjoys."—"I have perfect reliance on the knowledge and good intentions of our present Ministers—but very little on the knowledge possessed by the country at large. And if Ministers are unsupported by the country at large—if each class, in turn, is to be permitted a complete or a partial monopoly, and bribed by this sacrifice of the general and permanent interest [Query!—the interest of the avarita and tax-eaters, whom Sir James Graham calls "the drones of the hive," I. B.] of the public to its own partial and immediate advantage, to allow others to clamour for the power to exercise a similar oppression—if Ministers are not aided by the public voice in their struggles against individual rapacity—we shall tread backwards with greater rapidity, the few steps which we have so laboriously gained. In a representative government, where each individual may proclaim, in their utmost exaggeration, his sufferings and his fears, where the power arbitrarily to do good is chained by the same fetters which restrain the power arbitrarily to do evil—where, in short, *public opinion is omnipotent*, and is, on these subjects, so ill-informed, and therefore so easily misunderstood,—there appears at first sight, no limit to the extent to which individual interest, popular prejudices, and national jealousy, might next carry the system of exclusion."

From the *Mercantile Theory of Wealth*, by Mr. Senior, an old and distinguished authority of the Political Economists.

"A man born unto a world already possessed, if he cannot get subsistence from his parents, and if society does not want his labour, has no claim of right to the smallest portion of food, and in fact, has no business to be where he is."—*Maitius*.

"The science of money, and the science of employing the working classes, is one and the same science, the security of the labour power against the money power, forming the great and only vital constitutional question in all countries, but more especially in Great Britain, whose population is in more artificial circumstances than any other people; and when a sufficient number of honest and independent-minded men come to see this, a great popular party will be formed, which will upset the machinations of the fixed standard bullionists, and thus save the country a revolution."

My communication to *Glasgow Examiner*, of 21st Oct., 1848.

To the Editor of the *Greenock Advertiser*—20th August, 1849.

Sir.—The prejudice against universal suffrage is fast fading away, and many like myself believe it would, in our circumstances, be a highly conservative measure as enfranchising the agricultural labourers to a greater extent than any other class, besides securing a due representation for the sea-faring interest. The happy result of the experiment in France may have contributed to this; but the main cause of it is, that without an extension of the suffrage we see no means of the nation throwing off the incubus of political economy, or irreconcileable Free Trade, which at best can only be viewed by our native industry as a slow death, while it at once loses the colonies to the empire. It is quite clear that the political economists have always dreaded the true expression of the public opinion by an extended franchise, having no confidence in the working masses, (or rather, perhaps, having no confidence that their theoretical absurdities could ever be introduced otherwise than arbitrarily into any country); and the working classes having had confidence in them

\* It is not generally known that Earl Stanhope proposed, many years ago, a scheme of Universal Suffrage. This I of course would object to as perpetuating class legislation; but I think it well to give it here. The following are the resolutions submitted to Earl Grey's Government in the year 1830. In Lord Stanhope's opinion the House of Commons ought not to contain more than 500 members; and to each of the classes below he would give the election of one hundred representatives. [Just as we were going to press, we learn that the resolutions intended to be given here are to be published in London, with suitable explanations, and we therefore omit them.]

† Though united against British industry, it will be seen, from the following, that these Free Trade newspapers are not united among themselves. They are, in fact, in the same position as our political characters in Parliament, not united by any common principle, if not from a common want of principle:—"THE NICARAGUA DISPUTE.—An' he misundertanding which is alleged to have sprung up between the English and American Governments, in reference to the claim of sovereignty set up by the state of Nicaragua to the Mosquito territory, may lead to some serious diplomatic difficulties hereafter, it is very desirable that Englishmen should have a correct notion of the facts involved in the dispute. We have, therefore, copied from the *Globe* of Thursday last a very able article in reply to one which appeared in the *Times* of the preceding day, and in which the facts were very much distorted, with the evident design of assailing Lord Palmerston. It is, indeed, greatly to be regretted that an influential journal like the *Times* should be so far warped by a bitter personal animosity, as to disregard not only justice and fairness towards the individual, but even the honour and welfare of the country."—The *Manchester Guardian* of Saturday, 24th Nov., 1849. This character of the *Times* is tolerably well borne out by the following from a late number of the *Eclectic Review*; and UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE is loudly demanded if for no other purpose than to render it possible to have our political parties placed beyond the control of the London Money Market and its organ the *Times*:—"To say nothing of the more notoriously immoral portion of our press, such journals as the *Times* are a standing reproach to the country, and could not maintain their position for a week, if the state of our public mind were sound and healthy. Able, but unprincipled; with vast resources, but destitute of conscience; at one moment suppressing truth, and at another unblushingly giving utterance to lies; pandering to the tyrant of the day, whenever that tyrant may be; opposing every generous and philanthropic scheme with virulence so long as there is a hope of crushing it, and then contemptibly joining its ranks, and claiming to share its triumphs; adopting the patriotism only to serve the purposes of power; the seeming friend, but the bitter enemy of the poor; the *Times* is emphatically the curse and the reproach of our land."

has arisen simply from utter ignorance of what was meant by the much vaunted word "suffrage." How could the political economists forget that the navigation law was the work of Oliver Cromwell and the Long Parliament, and that, though our colonial system may date its nominal origin from Queen Elizabeth, it owed all its vitality and development to the extreme democracy of the great rebellion? They had proof, too, that the protection of native industry and a pure democracy are almost synonymous terms, in the puritans, whom persecution drove away to another land, transmitting this old British principle unimpaired to their posterity. THE BATTLE, HOWEVER, OF NATIVE INDUSTRY AGAINST THE POLITICAL ECONOMISTS MAY NOW BE SAID TO BE GAINED, for the working classes will no longer be humbugged; they will trust no man who is not their friend politically, &c., who will not vote for universal suffrage by the ballot. Universal suffrage would make short work with theories of all sorts; and, at all events, few or no men would be returned to Parliament who believe, like the bulk of our present economists legislators, that a system which produces more employment, and consequently better wages, should be condemned as *restrictive of trade*, because it practically reduces the *exchangeable value of money*!

In fact, I consider that the metropolitan and Manchester press may be viewed as chiefly that which the political economists now rely on. Through this great mental machinery (for the stifling, as it is unfortunately in *now*, of public opinion instead of its honest expression), the money power of this country affects, for instance, to smother at the social condition and prospects of France, as if these were not now infinitely better than they ever were before! I believe that if the French would only secure a strong permanent Executive, fixing on Louis Napoleon or any other man, as Emperor, they have the most workable Legislature of the present day, and one to which, for the security of the throne, every loyal British subject will soon desire to see ours approximating, in moral weight and *so far* as to have both houses elected by universal suffrage, the nobility, with perhaps the baronetcy, however, only being eligible for the Upper House as members. Such being the state of things, I have deemed it useful to bring forward, as I now do, the views of General Lafayette in 1830, of "a monarchy for France, surrounded by Republican Institutions," believing that on the adoption, *soon enough*, by us of these views, somewhat modified, depends the continued supremacy of this great empire. I desire, however, to repeat that *Leagues* as it is with the political economists, or money power, the press is nearly as great an evil commercially, as in other things it is a benefit to this country. Indeed, Mr. Alison, in his work on *population*, states a view of what the possible effects of the press might be in smothering freedom, not much darker than our present experience of it in this country, while in some of the Colonies there is a section of the press even more degraded from its more immediate contact with the Colonial Office, or its representatives:—

"It may be relied on, that if the bulk of the people become corrupted, either from the selfishness of repose, the enjoyments of pleasure, the passions of power, or the luxuries of opulence, the press will become the most fatal instrument that ever was devised for destroying the liberties of mankind; for it will throw its enervating spell over their minds, and deprive them even of the wish to regain their freedom."

But some of these men of the cosmopolitan press, and others who do not understand our subject from *actual experience* but from books, their mind being at best a mere granary of other men's thoughts, have often asked me to explain this. How, say they, do you reconcile your assertion that low prices of commodities are a *mere consequence* of low wages with your assertion that high wages will benefit the working man? If he has to pay proportionately high for his commodities, where is his gain from higher wages? Such in fact is the miserable drivell, if it is not the deep and intended deception, of the *science* of political Economy my so called. They try to make the effort of the advocates of native industry appear to be to affect comparative prices by legis-

lation. They either do not know, or conceal that they know, of a state of high wages under one system, or condition of trade, compared with what under another law would be the wages (measured by the quantity of commodities they will procure). The term *higher* of my lamented friend Lord George Bentinck had no reference, to "higher wages contrasted with the price of commodities at the time." The soul of honour, he would not have given a descriptio to win the cause nearest his heart (and that was the well-being of our working classes), far from being guilty of a humbug or "dodge" in actual terms, like the political economists, as to *price*. Lord George Bentinck meant the straightforward proposition that his system would give the poor man a balance in his pocket after procuring the same quantity of food and clothing. His grasp of mind enabled him to discover the dross from the ore of any argument; and he saw that the only way *actually* to raise wages was to *increase the number of the bidders* for the labour of our mechanics and manufacturing population. More employment, in fact, is the mother of more wages; and the great vital question (and which legislation really can affect) is "EMPLOYMENT"—not price. This increased employment, we believe, can only arise from benefitting the *employers of labour* (as opposed to the mere *employer of money*), or, in other words, increasing their ability to employ British labour; and this we can only do by doing away the blighting influence of the foreign trade on our internal paper circulation. **THIS IS PRACTICALLY TO REPUDIATE POLITICAL ECONOMY.** We have no wish to restrict the import of foreign labour except when its introduction manifestly tends to upset our banking system, and thus, by doing away with our national employment, be the instrument of discontent among our industrial masses and eventually of revolution.

Even if he did a fortunate thing, this can never excuse Sir R. Peel for setting the example of a disregard of the constituencies, which, if followed, might lose this country its best secured and most valued institutions, and even the crown itself; although no voice may have been lifted against these at the hustings! Nor could the *after assent* of the constituencies (which showed that their independence was gone, and that the country could have nothing worse in the shape of electors) do away with Sir Robert's guilt; it could only save him, as a thief is saved, from punishment. But the more important question with me has always been: is the national employment to be reduced or not, by this new, or irreciprocal Free Trade, system? And so decided did I at once, from my experience of business, answer this in the affirmative, that the only consolation I had was one which originated with the occasion. On seeing so much of the talent of the nation in favour of a measure which I saw must inevitably work its own overthrow (or rather *exposure*, for, an atheism, and not a principle in commerce, our now absence of system cannot strictly speaking be *overthrown*), I could not avoid feeling more strongly than I ever could otherwise have done, that *there is a principle in the government of this world above the influence of human legislation, which statesmen can only temporally defy, but cannot destroy.* Indeed, I well remember saying to Lord George Bentinck, that if he and Mr D'Israeli, and all the members of both Houses of Parliament, with all the constituencies at their back, were to *league* together to carry out the irreciprocal Free Trade of Sir R. Peel, all would not do. I then (early in 1846) spoke strongly because I felt strongly; and if in these letters to the *Advertiser*, which I am now concluding, I have appeared to use language too vehement for the occasion, I feel sure this will not be the general opinion two years hence.

I can not be supposed to mean that no honest or good man could be led away by the fallacies of political economy, for this was the case of the most eminent man of the church to which I have the honour to belong, who was also, perhaps, the finest mind of modern times. None of the conspirators of the money market, who hold their unholy orgies over that grossed of all the acts of the political economists—Sir R. Peel's money bill of 1819—ever did the harm, as influencing the public mind, which Dr Chalmers did on the subject of political economy; and, strange to say, by it was this great man's mind perverted into a distrust of the working classes for whom it may be said that he had lived; for in his *political economy, in connection with the moral state and moral prospects of society*, we find the following:

"A liberal politics forms no guarantee, but, we doubt, the opposite, for a liberal political economy. This is a SUBJECT ON WHICH THE POPULAR AND PHILOSOPHIC MIND ARE NOT AT ALL IN HARMONY; and the very admission into Parliament of so large an influence from the will of the humbler classes may, after all, endanger the cause of sound legislation, on every topic where the seeming and the substantial interests of the country are at variance."—Your obedient humble servant, **ISAAC BUCHANAN.**

#### WHEN ARE CORN DUTIES PAID BY THE FOREIGNER?

To the Editor of the *North British Daily Mail.*

Sir.—Perhaps, as only desiring the development of the truth, you will allow me to make a few remarks on the subject of the

\* We could safely free trade with nations that take payment in British goods, were our money law so altered as to enable our taxation to be included in "price," as then we would be recovering from the foreigner a portion of our taxation; and by levying 15 per cent. on the produce and manufactures of countries that refuse our very liberal terms of Reciprocity, (we would take quite free the produce of every country that does not charge us more than 15 per cent. on any article of British manufacture—see page 6.) we would *always* be saved taxation to the amount the British treasury is replenished, while the foreign importer would not be able to recover the duty in "price" except when the market is not fully supplied, at which time we should levy no duty.

† The first loss comes out of the Tenant's Capital, but ultimately our heavy British taxation (if it is not got back in "price") has no alternative but to become a deduction from wages, manufacturers and landlords being equally victims of the money-lord.

second leading article in your number of to-day. I, of course, am—as I have always been, and, I believe, will always be—an ardent advocate for the protection of "Native Industry"; but this, I feel, is not incompatible with desiring to see the greatest amount of "free imports," or "cheapness," which is not productive of "lessened employment." And, though firm in my belief that the cause of true protection is the cause of philanthropy, &c. &c. \*

But, even supposing that human nature were different from what it is, and that our politicians of both sides were undoubtedly philanthropists, and could afford to have no other object in view than the elevation of the working-classes, there would still remain the question of the best means of attaining their patriotic purpose; and it is only on this high ground, and not with the least view to party purposes, that I have, since 1846, persisted in stating the following case, in opposition to your view, that the consumer, in this country, would always pay the import duty on foreign food, were such imposed.

I admit that when *there is a deficiency of wheat* in this country the consumer would pay a rise in price equivalent to the duty on the foreign wheat which we import. I admit this for argument's sake, and as being quite willing to concur in having *free imports* when the price of wheat rises above the price of a full market; but, at same time, I deny that it is the *duty itself* which directly increases the price, or, that in a time of scarcity, wheat which had paid no import duty would sell for less than "wheat which had paid 8d per quarter to the Revenue. It being the law of supply and demand" that entirely regulates the price of articles, the stock of which we chiefly grow ourselves, will have the same quantity of wheat, whatever it cost the holder, will have the same effect in reducing the price; and the admission I make above, amounts only to an acknowledgment that the consumer in this country would have to pay a higher price from the import duty did it prevent the stock being increased to a full supply.

My argument, therefore, against *free imports* being for the *advantage of the labouring classes*, comes only into play when we have a well supplied market; (independently of supplies of wheat for which we shall have to *pay away gold*, thus extirpating the Bank facilities of this country); and if our home-growth of wheat, aided by supplies from the colonies and other reciprocating countries, does not keep down the price of wheat to that of a fully supplied market—say 4d per quarter—I have no objections to receiving foreign wheat, duty free, till the price is again brought down to that of a full market; as it appears to me monstrous to suppose that the farmer should be allowed to benefit by food being scarce. But I argue that the price of wheat in a fully supplied market—say 4d—indicates the lowest price at which it can be sold to cover the *direct and indirect taxation*, local as well as general, of this country, and that a fall in price below this is an evil to all classes, as ruining the agricultural customers of our manufacturing and mechanical population. My principles would not lead me to refuse to take wheat from foreigners that take payment in British goods,\* even when the price is under 4d; but for us to *pay gold* for wheat, in such case, appears to me **NOT ONLY TO RUIN THE FARMERS, AND, THROUGH HIM, ALL OTHER CLASSES OF THE COMMUNITY, BUT DIRECTLY TO RUIN ALL CLASSES, BY DEPRIVING THE COUNTRY, AS IN 1846, OF ITS BANK FACILITIES.**

But to add to the calamity of driving the agriculturists to pay their taxation, local and general, as well as their rents less or more, out of their capital, and by thus extirpating profit to deprive the classes requiring employment of the co-operation of capital, it appears to me that **WHEN THE PRICE IS UNDER THAT OF A FULL MARKET, WE MAKE A PENSUM OF THE DUTY TO THE FOREIGN PRODUCER.** I think that he will save the 8d which should go to the revenue; the additional fall in price of his wheat causes an apparent saving to the consumer, to stand against his reduced employment, and for which it is but an insignificant set off, for, as the Irishman who came to Liverpool said, "He could get anything in Ireland for sixpence, but the only question was, how to get the sixpence?" You must pardon me if I continue to hold these views as long as I continue to hold that the only regulator of the price of bread-stuffs is the *law of supply and demand*. Indeed, I am persuaded that all will yet come to see that, when our provision markets are so full as that wheat has fallen 8d per quarter below that which a full supply would indicate—say to 4d—the foreigner importing wheat, instead of getting 4d, to cover his 8d import duty, would actually get less than 4d by the amount of the fall in price which his additional quantity of wheat brings about in the British market. I feel confident that, in the case I allude to—which is now about becoming the experience of this country—the foreigner would, out of his own pocket, pay the 8d duty, were such imposed, and have it in his power only to take away gold to the extent of 32s (instead of 4d with free imports.)

Yours faithfully,

**ISAAC BUCHANAN.**

Glasgow, Jan. 14, 1850.

